

fense workers and service personnel. Specifically TCDNA desires to extend the FHA insurance system to include mortgage insurance of trailercoaches and rental projects of such mobile housing. (3) None. (4) A \$500,-retainer fee has been paid and subsequent fees will be on a monthly billing basis depending on how much time devoted to my client's interests.

A. Edward L. Wilson, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.; managing director of Traller Coach Manufacturers Association, a trade association representing manufacturers of trailer coaches.

B. Traller Coach Manufacturer Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. A trade association representing manufacturers of trailer coaches.

C. (1) Approximately 6 months. (2) Defense housing bills, H. R. 1272 and S. 349, proposed excise-tax legislation. (3) None. The association receives dues from its membership to support all of its activities. At this time it is not possible to allocate proportion of dues received which will be used for legislative activities. Quarterly report will contain list of contributors as required by act.

A. Rufus H. Wilson, assistant service director, AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), veterans' organization, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), veterans' organization, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Veterans' legislation and programs, defense projects, Americanism projects, housing legislation, (3) Monthly newspapers, 125,000 per month, 10th of each month, AMVETS national headquarters (actual printing done by Mercury Press). (4) Salary, \$4,400 per year; indefinite time; expenses unknown, approximately \$300 per year.

A. Wyatt, Grafton & Grafton, 300 Marion E. Taylor Building, Louisville, Ky.; legal services.

B. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (The National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes has been reconstituted and has changed its name in accordance with the foregoing.)

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation. (3) None. (4) (a) Compensation is to be paid, when billed, in accordance with the nature and extent of services rendered. (b) Indefinite. (c) Customary out-of-pocket expenses such as telephone, telegraph, hotel, transportation, and other such travel and office expenses.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C., office of executive vice president.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 18, Memphis, Tenn., non-profit welfare organization to promote the consumption of American-grown cotton, cottonseed, and products thereof.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation affecting the raw cotton industry. (3) None. (4) In response to the information called for by the note No. 4 to section C of the form issued March 31, 1950, by the Secretary of the Senate to the House of Representatives, the following data is given: (a) Compensation will be made monthly; (b) no compensation, as such, received for performance of legislative duties performed on behalf of the National Cotton Council. Compensation is received for all duties performed by me for the council, only an incidental portion of which duties relate to legislative matters. Consequently, during each quarter, from the total compensation received by me, there will be allocated that portion attributable to

legislative activities and this sum will be reported on quarterly reports filed hereafter pursuant to section 308 of the statute; (c) the proximate period of employment is indefinite; (d) the nature and amount of the expenses will be those entirely incidental to the performance of any legislative matters and include such matters as travel per diem, etc.

SENATE

THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Gerhard E. Lenski, pastor, Grace Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, Thou who dost rule with power in human affairs, Thou who dost give power unto men that they may rule and govern for Thee, grant, we beseech Thee, unto those to whom Thou dost commit the solemn trust of the management of this world such knowledge of Thee and such reverence that in all things they may ever seek to serve, honor, and obey Thee.

We pray for the rulers of the United Nations that Thou wouldst enable them to defend our world from aggression and to preserve for us and all men the sanctities of life and law and liberty. We pray for the rulers of great lands more distant, for those more hostile, that Thou wouldst turn their minds from suspicion and distrust to thoughts of understanding, cooperation, and good will. We pray for those who negotiate peace in Korea and for our soldiers who carry our standards on the field of battle. We pray for our Chief Executive, that Thou wouldst strengthen and uphold him, for our Congress, for this Senate group, and for all our citizenry, that in all things we may walk the way of Thy commandments, building righteousness on the earth, serving the common good and evermore glorifying Thy holy name through Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Saviour, and our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, August 6, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on August 7, 1951, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 360. An act for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene; and

S. 1229. An act for the relief of Jan Josef Wlcekowski and his wife and daughter.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the intelligence of the death of

Hon. Wilson D. Gillette, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and transmitted the resolutions of the House thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 29. An act for the relief of Teresa E. Dwyer;

S. 236. An act for the relief of Nicholas George Strangas;

S. 350. An act for the relief of the Z. D. Gilman Co., Inc.;

S. 526. An act for the relief of Dr. Lorna Wan-Hsi-Feng;

S. 543. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Jean Clarke;

S. 581. An act for the relief of Kiyoko and Chiyoko Ishigo;

S. 585. An act for the relief of Shizu Fujii and her son, Suenori Fujii;

S. 674. An act for the relief of Arthur Hoestler;

S. 885. An act for the relief of Wong Thew Hor;

S. 1105. An act for the relief of K. C. Be, Swannio Be, Wie Go Be, Wie Hwa Be, Wie Bing Be, and Swie Tien Be;

S. 1281. An act for the relief of Eric Adolf Lenze;

S. 1282. An act for the relief of Cecil Lennox Elliott;

S. 1362. An act for the relief of Howard Lovell;

S. 1417. An act for the relief of Lefrancols & Chamberland, Inc.;

S. 1442. An act for the relief of Marie Louise Dewulf Maquet; and

S. 1443. An act for the relief of Rev. Thomas K. Sewall.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3282) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 to the bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 400), to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3795) to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34) favoring

the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Dora Jenny Wagner;

H. R. 804. An act for the relief of Sisters Maria DeRubertis, Agnese Cerina, Marianna Bonifacio, Dina Bonini, and Edvige Gasparini;

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Miroslav Kudrat;

H. R. 1265. An act for the relief of Zora Novacek, Daniela Novacek, and Frantisek Novacek;

H. R. 1413. An act for the relief of Franz Geyling;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of David Lee Harrigan;

H. R. 1672. An act for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association;

H. R. 1831. An act to admit Luigi Morelli to the United States for permanent residence;

H. R. 1911. An act for the relief of Chikako Shishikura;

H. R. 2165. An act for the relief of Matthew Terry;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Jean (John) Plewniak and Anna Piotrowska Plewniak;

H. R. 2444. An act for the relief of James A. Vines;

H. R. 2503. An act for the relief of Maria Rosa Bardales Arias;

H. R. 2505. An act for the relief of Carl Wettlanner;

H. R. 2621. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giulio Di Gaetano Cocchia;

H. R. 2821. An act to enact certain provisions now included in the Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Nison Miller;

H. R. 3830. An act to authorize the construction and equipment of a geomagnetic station for the Department of Commerce;

H. R. 3838. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett;

H. R. 3840. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary;

H. R. 4121. An act for the relief of Rafael Alemany;

H. R. 4127. An act for the relief of Mrs. Doris Ellen Young;

H. R. 4288. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana;

H. R. 4463. An act for the relief of Nadine Carol Heslip;

H. R. 4674. An act authorizing the Secretary of State to continue Herve J. L'Heureux to serve as Chief of the Visa Division for an additional year commencing September 1, 1951;

H. R. 4693. An act to amend section 77, subsection (c) (3), of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended;

H. J. Res. 281. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim a special period for intensified voluntary contributions of clothing and kindred supplies in connection with the collection effort of American Relief for Korea, Inc.; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

The message also further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 111) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1246. An act to amend certain laws relating to the submission of postmasters' accounts under oath, and for other purposes;

H. R. 400. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy;

H. R. 3795. An act to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to make restrictions of the Federal Reserve Act on holding office in a member bank inapplicable to M. S. Szymczak when he ceases to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for all of next week.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HOLLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor-Management Relations of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the Record and to transact other routine business without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF UNOBJECTIONED-TO BILLS ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the completion of the transaction of routine business the calendar be called for unobjectioned-to bills, beginning where the last call ended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 225)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which was

read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 9, 1951.
The honorable the VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am writing to ask that the Congress authorize a contribution of \$12,000,000 by the United States to the International Children's Emergency Fund. This sum would be authorized for the current fiscal year.

The General Assembly of the United Nations, on December 1, 1950, extended the operations of the Children's Fund for a period of 3 years. Since the authorization to make financial contributions to the fund expired last June 30, we can now make no further contribution without this new authority from the Congress.

The United States has a long tradition of participation in, and financial support for, international children's welfare work. Nothing is more consistent with our basic interests or more representative of our humanitarian ideals.

The Children's Fund has done a most constructive job over the last 4 years. In Europe, it has helped more than 15,000,000 children. The main work of the fund has now shifted from Europe to the underdeveloped areas of Asia and Latin America. Here the fund will bring supplies and services to help meet urgent needs of children and to strengthen the permanent child welfare programs of the countries themselves.

I know that the Congress is aware of the many past accomplishments of the Children's Fund. I am confident that the people of this country want to continue to support the great work the fund is doing. There is real need to carry on this work. Millions of children will be helped.

I have asked the Secretary of State to prepare draft legislation to carry out this recommendation. It is my hope that the Congress will find it possible to give early consideration to this measure.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FOR CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (S. DOC. NO. 54)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1952, in the amount of \$21,800,000, for the Department of Defense for Civil Functions, Department of the Army, in the form of amendments to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FARM LOAN ACT, RELATING TO SUBSCRIPTIONS TO CAPITAL STOCK OF FEDERAL LAND BANKS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation

to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to repeal the provisions therein for additional subscriptions on behalf of the United States to the capital stock of the Federal land banks (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Agriculture Department, for the period July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION OF CERTAIN ALIEN SEAMEN

Two letters from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an order of the Acting Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, dated October 20, 1950, authorizing the temporary admission into the United States, for shore-leave purposes only, certain alien seamen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED CERTAIN PERSONNEL

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel by the Department of the Air Force, for the fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the acts of the Fifth to the Twelfth Special Sessions of the Seventeenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, 1950-51 (with an accompanying volume); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF VIOLATION OF REVISED STATUTES

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Veterans' Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, a violation of the Revised Statutes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

NATIONAL MONUMENT COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Executive Officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOURNAL OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

A letter from the Executive, Department of the Secretary of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the Journal of the House of Representatives, Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, second special session, 1950 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by Rex Appleby Post 1557, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United

States, Milwaukie, Oreg., favoring the enactment of legislation to continue the low-cost housing program (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of the Jupiter Patriotic Association of America, Inc., of Chicago, Ill., praying for a redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the National Council, Junior Order of United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, Inc., at Old Point Comfort, Va., favoring the enactment of legislation to prohibit the display on school buildings of any flag constituting the emblem of any nation, or group of nations; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Solomon Valley Flood Control Association of Kansas, Minneapolis, Kans., relating to the construction of flood-control reservoirs; to the Committee on Public Works.

A petition signed by Flossie Meitz, and sundry other employees of the United States Engineer Office, Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation providing increased compensation for Federal employees; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS, SECRETARIES, AND DIRECTORS OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from Donald N. McDowell, director of the Wisconsin State Department of Agriculture a series of resolutions adopted by the convention of the North Central Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture at Waukesha, Wis., between July 10 and 12, 1951. These experts in the field of farm department administration commented on several important phases of agricultural problems. Their resolutions preceded, of course, the latest consideration by the Congress of the farm-price question. I believe, however, that their views will be of interest to my colleagues, and so I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD at this point and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for appropriate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS, SECRETARIES, AND DIRECTORS OF AGRICULTURE AT THEIR CONVENTION AT WAUKESHA, WIS., JULY 10, 11, 12, 1951

Whereas members of this association are aware that the consuming public are being led to believe that farmers are receiving unreasonably high prices: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the North Central Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture assembled in Waukesha, Wis., on July 10, 11, and 12, 1951, call attention to the following facts:

1. The majority of all farm products are below parity prices.

2. Prices for most farm commodities have dropped to levels lower than during the immediate postwar period, while during the same time, the price index of commodities purchased by farmers were rising to an all-time high in the spring of 1951.

3. An hour of labor purchases more food today than ever before in history. An hour of labor in America purchases approximately two times as much food as an hour's work in England; nearly three times as much food as in Germany, France, and Belgium;

four times as much as in Italy, and seven times as much as in Russia; be it further

Resolved, That factual information be made available to the public showing that farmers are not now receiving a fair share of the national income, and that they are anxious and willing to meet the needs of the country in all emergencies.

Whereas most States have laws which properly control the manufacture and sale of commercial fertilizer; and

Whereas States are in the best position to carry on this work due to the fact that conditions vary widely in the several States; and

Whereas the control over manufacture and sale of commercial fertilizer by the United States Department of Agriculture would only add to confusion, duplication, and increased cost: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the North Central Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture assembled at Waukesha, Wis., July 10, 11, 12, 1951, are opposed to any act of Congress or regulations by the United States Department of Agriculture to usurp States' rights in its control of the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer.

Whereas the 1946 Congress unanimously passed the Hope-Flannagan Market Research Act; and

Whereas the original intent of Congress was for State departments of agriculture to set up market service programs; and

Whereas under such arrangements States are matching the Federal funds thereby doubling the service; and

Whereas State departments should not be penalized because of their delay in getting programs started, as such delay was necessitated by having to secure appropriations on the State level; and

Whereas States now have trained personnel and have commendable programs in operation; and

Whereas State departments of agriculture endorse reductions in Federal nondefense expenditures and are willing to accept the same percentage of reduction as other agencies receiving RMA funds; however, a reduction of 40 to 50 percent would severely handicap the operation of State programs: Therefore be it

Resolved by the North Central Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture assembled in Waukesha, Wis., July 10, 11, 12, 1951, That the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Agricultural Research Administration be requested to make available to State departments of agriculture sufficient funds to carry on present programs and to allow for reasonable expansion and the entrance of new States; be it further

Resolved, That the said agencies be required to distribute funds as was the original intent of Congress; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to all Congressmen and Senators representing the States in the north central region.

Whereas under the price control law the Office of Price Stabilization is empowered to establish price ceilings when prices of agricultural products reach parity; and

Whereas certain food products, including pork, poultry, and milk have been below parity for several months; and

Whereas the Office of Price Stabilization has been threatening to impose price ceilings, particularly on pork: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the North Central Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture in convention at Waukesha, Wis., July 10, 11, 12, 1951, opposes

this contemplated and unfair action by the Office of Price Stabilization, and that such action is prejudicial, and unjustly penalized American farmers, who have been producing these products below parity, and that the exercise of this arbitrary ruling by the Office of Price Stabilization will discourage production at a time when there is an urgent need for all the meat and dairy products that can be produced on the farms of this country.

MISSOURI BASIN FLOOD—RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution I have received which was adopted by the executive committee of the National Farmers Union in regard to the recent Kansas and Missouri floods.

The resolution asks that the Corps of Army Engineers be immediately relieved of all civil-work functions. It describes the recent flood-control meeting at Kansas City as a steam-roller operation by the Army engineers, ending in sectional meetings to organize a lobby to pressure this Congress for larger appropriations for Army reservoirs on the main stem and lower tributaries of the Missouri.

The Farmers Union contends that the Army engineers are as wrong when they say such reservoirs, plus levees, will control floods, as they were when they wrongly contended that levees alone would do the job. The resolution points out that unprecedented quantities of silt were moved in the recent flood obviously threatening the value of every dam which may be built for flood control or any other purpose in the affected area. It continues to be the position of this large organization of farmers that a truly integrated watershed program should be established in the Missouri Basin under a Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISSOURI BASIN FLOOD—RESOLUTION OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, ADOPTED JULY 27, 1951

Farmers in the United States have had enough—far more than enough indeed—of the Corps of Army Engineers in civil works and of jumbled, competing, back-biting, interagency boondoggling in our river valleys.

The recent disastrous failure of the Army's flood control works at Kansas City and the failure of their levees up and down the lower Missouri have once more demonstrated the complete folly and futility of the Army brand of flood control which starts at a river's mouth.

For a century this Nation was told that levees and sea walls on the lower rivers would do the job of flood control. Time after time as river bottoms built up and increased flows washed out or topped levees, we were told that the levees just were high enough; more money should be given the Army to build them higher.

On July 25, 1951, at a meeting at Kansas City designed and thoroughly stacked to put the heat on Congress again for more money for the Army, the Chief of United States Army Engineers finally admitted that more

than levees and sea walls are required; that there must be Army built dams and storage reservoirs upstream in the rivers before the levees will hold. The tragic failure of the Army's expensive Kansas City works was too close to ignore blandly. Simultaneously, however, Gen. Lewis A. Pick praised soil conservation but deprecated its value for flood control. Dams are the answer, he told his captive audience. Effort was even made at this controlled meeting to declare soil programs valueless in flood control but it was so raw that it failed. It could not be put over in the face of graphs, on display on the platform, which revealed enormous increases in speed and volume of run-off in flood periods which are obviously related to man's use and management of the lands where rains fall. It was also too raw for the farmers who knew of the enormous quantities of silt which had been moved by the Kansas flood waters. Samples of water taken by farmers showed up to 12 percent of the flow was silt. Enormous deposits of mud are everywhere in the flooded areas. Hundreds of thousands of acres will have to be leveled and millions of tons of silt smoothed down before farming can start again in many places. In the watersheds stretching 200 miles from the flood plains, unprecedented gullying and sheet erosion are apparent to all those who travel on the surface of the area, and do not just fly over it at 300 miles an hour, stopping in a city or two.

This tremendous erosion and siltation obviously threatens the value of every dam which may be built for flood control or any other purpose in the affected area and belies efforts to deny that adequate land programs are an essential part of real flood control.

It should be completely clear that no one measure will end floods in the Missouri Basin. Even the Army engineers now confess, in face of the catastrophe at Kansas City, that levees alone will not do it. No responsible person ever contended that soil conservation alone will do it. And no sane person should today contend that dams and reservoirs alone are the key.

Obviously, every tool must be used in an integrated, concerted program of action—soil conservation, contouring, terracing, headwater check dams, main stem reservoirs, increase (not restriction) of channel capacity and levees. They are supplementary, but will never be so used while a multiplicity of agencies compete, undercut and deprecate each other as has continued in the Missouri Basin down through the July 25 meeting at Kansas City where two principal partners (Interior and Agriculture) were first completely ignored but finally forced themselves into obscure back seats.

The Farmers Union believes that every day's delay in creating a Missouri Valley Authority to put a comprehensive and truly coordinate program into effect in the Missouri Basin is an unwise waste of time.

Two private agencies, the Public Affairs Institute and the Regional Committee for an MVA, and two Federal Commissions, the Hoover Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government and the National Water Policy Commissions, have shown the Nation that the present Pick-Sloan plan is folly. But to this day all these warnings have been ignored. Nothing whatever has been done to reform, either nationally or in the Missouri Basin, our tragically inefficient and wasteful resources plans and administrative machinery.

On behalf of a half million farm people, heavily concentrated in the Missouri and Arkansas River Valleys where the Nation's latest flood debacle occurred, the Farmers Union therefore urges you to take immediate

action on the reports previously made and specifically the following steps:

1. Immediately relieve the Corps of Army Engineers of all civil works functions.

2. Establish as quickly as possible a Missouri Valley Authority.

3. To make the utmost of every day of time, immediately establish a Presidential Commission, independent of all agencies now involved in the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee and aided by the finest water engineers, to review present Missouri Basin plans, begin development of an adequate integrated plan, and make such interim reports to the Executive and Congress as will speed the start of essential work. This interim commission should be dissolved when an MVA is established.

4. Authorize now a land, forest, and small watershed program which can go forward with extensive work in areas of high erosion, high flood danger and in the watersheds of reservoirs subject to serious siltation.

5. Create a national board of review to start work at once on the myriad and conflicting plans of our many Government agencies affecting the watersheds of the Nation outside the Missouri Basin.

The people of this Nation, and particularly the millions of farm people watching their resources washed away, are worn out with half way measures and inaction.

They know that the United States Army Engineers and their associated contractors, power companies, railroads, State officials, and other vested interest groups are a tough lobby to fight. They are aware of General Pick's repeated successful defiance of the Executive department, typified by his recent boast at Omaha at the Inland Governors' Conference that the engineers answer to no one but Congress. And they were made fully aware by Wednesday's Pick meeting at Kansas City, and the Army engineers' open organization of a lobby association there, that the engineers do not intend to take the instructions from Congress, but to give instruction to Congress through their controlled pressure groups.

Farmers are fully aware of all these things, but they insist that the situation demands an immediate all-out fight, and not a shrinking from responsibility on the excuse that the opposition is formidable.

The flood tragedy in the Missouri Basin can be repeated tomorrow almost anywhere in the United States. Action is needed right now to reorganize our watershed administrative agencies and start work on wise, comprehensive and coordinated watershed development plans.

We insist that responsible officials act, and act vigorously, without further delay.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR ADVERTISING—LETTER, RESOLUTION, AND PETITIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from Mrs. Stella Tucker, secretary of the Burlington (Wash.) WCTU, transmitting a resolution and a petition of the ministers and members of the First Baptist Church, and the Assembly of God Church, of Burlington, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter, resolution, and petitions be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, resolution, and petitions were referred

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 22, 1951.

Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Will you please present this petition to Congress? We feel a deep concern over the findings of the Kefauver committee concerning the increase in criminal gangsters in our country. We realize that these gangs are promoted by gambling and liquor. How can we impress upon our children the harm of these things when the Government is allowing the liquor traffic to teach children to drink by way of ads in magazines, billboard, and television, and to glorify crime? The beer ads and drinking scenes over television are making television sets worthless in the home.

Please present a bill in Congress at once to prevent this harm.

Very truly yours,

(Mrs.) STELLA TUCKER,
Secretary, Burlington WCTU.

SUGGESTED RESOLUTION

Whereas the American people have been shocked beyond words at the disclosures of crime and corruption in our Government and by the invasion of gangsters into our business life; and

Whereas the disclosures of the Kefauver committee show a direct connection between the underworld and the liquor traffic; and

Whereas this traffic is teaching our youth to aid in supporting and financing this structure of crime through alcoholic beverage advertising forced on the public through magazines, newspapers, and especially over the air through radio and television: Be it

Resolved, That we urge our Representatives in Congress to stop the spreading and increase of this evil by passing laws prohibiting the advertising of alcoholic beverages through interstate commerce and over the air.

The enclosed signatures [not printed] were obtained from members of our congregation in Burlington.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH,
Rev. CARL ANGLE.

PETITION OF FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, REV. CARL ANGLE, PASTOR

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to protect us in our rights as parents and as purchasers by passing legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in our magazines and newspapers. Our television sets are being rendered worse than useless by alcoholic beverage advertising, and our children

are being led to believe that alcohol is harmless and to glorify crime by means of such advertising.

PETITION OF ASSEMBLY OF GOD CHURCH, REV. F. D. HOLFORD, PASTOR

To Our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We, the undersigned, respectfully petition you to protect us in our rights as parents and as purchasers by passing legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising over the radio and television and in our magazines and newspapers. Our television sets are being rendered worse than useless by alcoholic beverage advertising, and our children are being led to believe that alcohol is harmless and to glorify crime by means of such advertising.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1489. A bill to prevent the entry of certain mollusks into the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 628).

By Mr. MCFARLAND (for Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado), from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 436. A bill to provide for the separation of subsidy from air-mail pay, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 629).

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "THE NEED FOR INDUSTRIAL DISPERSAL"

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 173), submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on July 11, 1951, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "The Need for Industrial Dispersal," prepared by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, be printed as a Senate document.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS OF FINANCE COMMITTEE RELATING TO REVENUE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 179), submitted by Mr. MILLIKIN on July 23, 1951, reported it favorably without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That 800 additional copies of part 1 and of each subsequent part of the hearings held before the Committee on Finance on H. R. 4473 to provide revenue, and for other purposes, be printed for the use of said committee.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON HEALTH INSURANCE PLANS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 176), submitted by Mr. LEHMAN on July 17, 1951, reported it favorably, with an amendment, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, in line 2, after the word "use" to strike out "five" and insert "three."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to have printed for its use 3,000 copies of parts 2 and 3 of Senate Report No. 359, Eighty-second Congress, a report on health insurance plans in the United States.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of June 1951, and in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MAY-JUNE 1951, AND PAY, APRIL-MAY 1951

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for June 1951 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In June numbered—	In May numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)	In May was—	In April was—	Increase (+) or decrease (—)
Total.....	\$2,486,755	\$2,443,106	\$+43,649	\$729,984	\$676,198	+\$53,786
1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment.....	1,251,154	1,235,457	+15,697	366,547	344,983	+21,564
2. National Military Establishment.....	1,235,601	1,207,649	+27,952	363,437	331,215	+32,222
Within the National Military Establishment:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	2,194	2,172	+22	957	889	+68
Department of the Army.....	521,075	510,268	+10,807	142,947	132,605	+10,342
Department of the Air Force.....	260,736	249,821	+10,915	73,499	64,346	+9,153
Department of the Navy.....	451,596	445,388	+6,208	146,034	133,375	+12,659

MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
Table V shows personnel counted in tables I, II, III, and IV who are assigned to the

mutual defense assistance program by the State Department, Economic Cooperation Administration, and by the component units

of the National Military Establishment, together with their pay.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1951, and comparison with May 1951, and pay for May 1951, and comparison with April 1951

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	April	May	Increase	Decrease	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):								
Agriculture.....	20,392	22,772	2,380	-----	78,877	84,400	5,523	-----
Commerce ¹	18,228	19,227	999	-----	59,252	59,033	-----	219
Interior.....	17,893	19,652	1,759	-----	60,647	63,907	3,260	-----
Justice.....	11,065	12,379	1,314	-----	30,576	31,795	1,219	-----
Labor.....	2,470	2,746	276	-----	7,875	7,801	-----	74
Post Office.....	129,797	131,353	1,556	-----	500,108	501,344	1,236	-----
State.....	8,378	9,282	904	-----	28,012	29,386	1,374	-----
Treasury.....	29,715	30,878	1,163	-----	91,989	91,486	-----	503
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office.....	133	135	2	-----	280	265	-----	15
Bureau of the Budget.....	258	275	17	-----	512	522	10	-----
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	17	18	1	-----	70	67	-----	3
National Security Council ²	9	9	-----	-----	19	19	-----	-----
National Security Resources Board.....	70	82	12	-----	143	118	-----	25
Council of Economic Advisers.....	32	24	-----	8	40	41	1	-----
Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion.....	5	5	-----	-----	20	17	-----	3
Emergency agencies (1950-51):								
Defense Production Administration.....	155	182	27	-----	405	419	14	-----
Defense Transport Administration.....	64	77	13	-----	202	213	11	-----
Economic Stabilization Agency.....	2,145	2,950	805	-----	7,938	10,470	2,532	-----
Federal Civil Defense Administration.....	273	306	33	-----	576	616	40	-----
Office of Defense Mobilization.....	35	44	9	-----	127	182	55	-----
President's Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights.....	2	2	-----	-----	8	9	1	-----
President's Materials Policy Commission.....	20	30	10	-----	50	82	32	-----
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	12	15	3	-----	27	26	-----	1
Postwar agencies:								
Displaced Persons Commission.....	153	138	-----	15	355	346	-----	9
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	1,825	1,709	-----	116	5,346	5,503	157	-----
Motor Carrier Claims Commission.....	9	9	-----	-----	15	15	-----	-----
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	852	897	45	-----	2,516	2,498	-----	18
Philippine Alien Property Administration ³	8	5	-----	3	44	5	-----	39
Philippine War Damage Commission.....	11	-----	-----	11	-----	-----	-----	-----
War Claims Commission.....	50	49	-----	1	144	158	14	-----
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	78	81	3	-----	767	814	47	-----
Atomic Energy Commission.....	2,110	2,366	256	-----	5,556	5,728	172	-----
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	234	253	19	-----	526	537	11	-----
Civil Service Commission.....	1,287	1,454	167	-----	4,272	4,479	207	-----
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	65	68	3	-----	128	133	5	-----
Federal Communications Commission.....	440	507	67	-----	1,200	1,205	5	-----
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	392	421	29	-----	1,035	1,051	-----	4
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	195	208	13	-----	358	368	10	-----
Federal Power Commission.....	205	327	122	-----	731	744	13	-----
Federal Security Agency ⁴	10,092	11,053	961	-----	35,395	35,912	517	-----
Federal Trade Commission.....	204	329	125	-----	688	758	70	-----
General Accounting Office.....	2,339	2,549	210	-----	6,894	6,888	-----	6
General Services Administration.....	6,849	8,349	1,500	-----	29,698	30,376	678	-----
Government Printing Office.....	2,714	3,012	298	-----	7,420	7,489	69	-----
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	4,901	4,989	88	-----	13,570	13,466	-----	104
Indian Claims Commission.....	7	7	-----	-----	11	11	-----	-----
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	848	940	92	-----	2,186	2,150	-----	36
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.....	2,575	2,922	347	-----	7,661	7,926	265	-----
National Capital Housing Authority.....	88	97	9	-----	336	327	-----	9
National Capital Park and Planning Commission.....	2	3	1	-----	8	10	2	-----
National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission.....	10	32	22	-----	194	217	23	-----
National Gallery of Art.....	80	93	13	-----	324	317	-----	7
National Labor Relations Board.....	554	597	43	-----	1,453	1,500	47	-----
National Mediation Board.....	63	68	5	-----	113	113	-----	-----
National Science Foundation.....	5	12	7	-----	46	43	-----	3
Panama Canal.....	3,202	3,327	125	-----	20,414	20,232	-----	182
Railroad Retirement Board.....	636	689	53	-----	2,025	2,118	93	-----
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	1,242	1,341	99	-----	2,589	2,682	93	-----
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	436	456	20	-----	1,053	1,027	-----	26
Selective Service System.....	1,593	1,776	183	-----	8,401	8,343	-----	58
Smithsonian Institution.....	173	193	20	-----	610	629	19	-----
Soldiers' Home.....	115	114	-----	1	735	743	8	-----
Tariff Commission.....	94	102	8	-----	206	210	4	-----
Tax Court of the United States.....	61	62	1	-----	125	124	-----	1
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	6,191	6,857	666	-----	18,183	18,990	747	-----
Veterans' Administration.....	50,677	55,643	4,966	-----	184,373	182,831	-----	1,542
Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....	344,983	366,547	21,719	155	1,235,457	1,251,154	18,584	2,687
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment.....	-----	-----	21,564	-----	-----	-----	15,697	-----
National Military Establishment:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense ⁵	889	957	68	-----	2,172	2,194	22	-----
Department of the Army:	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Inside continental United States.....	121,308	130,662	9,354	-----	461,665	472,146	10,481	-----
Outside continental United States.....	11,297	12,255	958	-----	48,603	48,929	326	-----
Department of the Air Force:	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Inside continental United States.....	58,966	67,357	8,391	-----	221,624	232,396	10,772	-----
Outside continental United States.....	5,380	6,142	762	-----	28,197	28,340	143	-----
Department of the Navy:	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Inside continental United States.....	125,149	136,641	11,492	-----	411,905	418,376	6,471	-----
Outside continental United States.....	8,226	9,393	1,167	-----	33,483	33,220	-----	263
Total, National Military Establishment.....	331,215	363,437	32,222	-----	1,207,649	1,235,601	28,215	263
Net increase, National Military Establishment.....	-----	-----	32,222	-----	-----	-----	27,952	-----
Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	676,198	729,984	53,941	155	2,443,106	2,486,755	46,799	3,150
Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....	-----	-----	53,786	-----	-----	-----	43,649	-----

¹ June figure includes 4,258 employees of National Production Authority, District of Columbia area only. May employment, 5,069.

NOTE.—National Production Authority now only reports employees in Washington, D. C., area. Field employees are reported by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

² June figure is exclusive of 5,928 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

³ Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

⁴ Deactivated June 29, 1951, by Executive Order 9818 and transferred to the Justice Department.

⁵ June figures preliminary.

⁶ Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

⁷ Includes 222 employees assigned to Munitions Board Cataloging Agency and 29 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

⁸ Revised.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1951, and comparison with May 1951

Department or agency	May	June	In-crease	De-crease	Department or agency	May	June	In-crease	De-crease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	76,603	82,025	5,422		General Accounting Office.....	6,894	6,888		6
Commerce ¹	55,432	55,181		251	General Services Administration.....	29,624	30,298	674	
Interior.....	53,542	56,264	2,722		Government Printing Office.....	7,420	7,489	69	
Justice.....	30,049	31,260	1,211		Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	13,464	13,359		105
Labor.....	7,797	7,721		76	Indian Claims Commission.....	11	11		
Post Office.....	498,202	499,424	1,222		Interstate Commerce Commission.....	2,186	2,150		36
State.....	10,455	10,732	277		National Advisory Committee for Aero- nautics.....	7,661	7,926	265	
Treasury.....	91,224	90,716		508	National Capital Housing Authority.....	336	327		9
Executive Office of the President:					National Capital Park and Planning Com- mission.....	8	10	2	
White House Office.....	280	265		15	National Capital Sesquicentennial Com- mission.....	194	217	23	
Bureau of the Budget.....	512	522	10		National Gallery of Art.....	324	317		7
Executive Mansion and Grounds.....	70	67		3	National Labor Relations Board.....	1,434	1,476	42	
National Security Council ²	19	19			National Mediation Board.....	113	113		
National Security Resources Board.....	143	118		25	National Science Foundation.....	46	43		3
Council of Economic Advisers.....	40	41	1		Panama Canal.....	608	600		8
Commission on Renovation of the Execu- tive Mansion.....	20	17		3	Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,025	2,118	93	
Emergency agencies (1950-51):					Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	2,581	2,674	93	
Defense Production Administration.....	405	419	14		Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,053	1,027		26
Defense Transport Administration.....	202	213	11		Selective Service System.....	8,161	8,103		58
Economic Stabilization Agency.....	7,812	10,323	2,511		Smithsonian Institution.....	601	621	20	
Federal Civil Defense Administration.....	576	616	40		Soldiers' Home.....	735	743	8	
Office of Defense Mobilization.....	127	182	55		Tariff Commission.....	206	210	4	
President's Commission on Internal Secu- rity and Individual Rights.....	8	9	1		Tax Court of the United States.....	125	124		1
President's Materials Policy Commission.....	50	82	32		Tennessee Valley Authority.....	18,183	18,930	747	
Subversive Activities Control Board.....	27	26		1	Veterans' Administration.....	182,913	181,375		1,538
Postwar agencies:					Total, excluding National Military Es- tablishment.....	1,174,108	1,188,033	16,625	2,700
Displaced Persons Commission.....	129	129			Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment.....			13,925	
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	1,326	1,375	49		National Military Establishment:				
Motor Carrier Claims Commission.....	15	15			Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	1,217	2,194	22	
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	2,487	2,470		17	Department of the Army.....	461,665	472,146	10,481	
Philippine Alien Property Administra- tion ³	3	3			Department of the Air Force.....	221,624	232,396	10,772	
War Claims Commission.....	131	136	5		Department of the Navy.....	411,905	418,376	6,471	
Independent agencies:					Total, National Military Establishment.....	1,092,366	1,125,112	27,746	
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	16	17	1		Net increase, National Military Estab- lishment.....			27,746	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	5,551	5,723	172		Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	2,271,474	2,313,145	44,371	2,700
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	512	524	12		Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....			41,671	
Civil Service Commission.....	4,269	4,476	207						
Export-Import Bank of Washington.....	128	133	5						
Federal Communications Commission.....	1,175	1,181	6						
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.....	1,035	1,031		4					
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Ser- vice.....	358	368	10						
Federal Power Commission.....	731	744	13						
Federal Security Agency ⁴	35,053	35,559	506						
Federal Trade Commission.....	688	758	70						

¹ June figure includes 4,258 employees of National Production Authority, District of Columbia area only. May employment 5,062.

NOTE.—National Production Authority now only reports employees in Washington, D. C., area. Field employees are now reported by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

² June figure is exclusive of 5,928 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.

³ Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

⁴ Deactivated June 29, 1951, by Executive Order 9818 and transferred to the Justice Department.

⁵ June figure preliminary.

⁶ Includes personnel of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

⁷ Revised.

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during June 1951, and comparison with May 1951

Department or agency	May	June	In-crease	De-crease	Department or agency	May	June	In-crease	De-crease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture.....	2,274	2,375	101		National Labor Relations Board.....	19	24	5	
Commerce.....	3,820	3,852	32		Panama Canal.....	19,806	19,632		174
Interior.....	7,105	7,643	538		Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	8	8		
Justice.....	527	535	8		Selective Service System.....	240	240		
Labor.....	78	80	2		Smithsonian Institution.....	9	8		1
Post Office.....	1,906	1,920	14		Veterans' Administration.....	1,460	1,456		4
State.....	17,557	18,654	1,097		Total, excluding National Military Es- tablishment.....	61,349	63,121	2,002	230
Treasury.....	765	770	5		Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment.....			1,772	
Emergency agencies (1950-51): Economic Stabi- lization Agency.....	126	147	21		National Military Establishment:				
Postwar agencies:					Department of the Army.....	48,603	48,929	326	
Displaced Persons Commission.....	226	217		9	Department of the Air Force.....	28,197	28,340	143	
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	4,020	4,128	108		Department of the Navy.....	33,483	33,220		263
Office of the Housing Expediter.....	29	28		1	Total, National Military Establishment.....	110,283	110,489	469	263
Philippine Alien Property Administration.....	41	12		39	Net increase, National Military Estab- lishment.....			206	
War Claims Commission.....	13	22	9		Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	171,632	173,610	2,471	493
Independent agencies:					Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....			1,973	
American Battle Monuments Commission.....	751	797	46						
Atomic Energy Commission.....	5	5							
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	14	14							
Civil Service Commission.....	3	3							
Federal Communications Commission.....	25	24		1					
Federal Security Agency.....	342	353	11						
General Services Administration.....	74	78	4						
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	106	107	1						

¹ Preliminary.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during June 1951, and comparison with May 1951

Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	May	June	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except National Military Establishment):					National Military Establishment:				
Commerce.....	1,421	1,350		71	Department of the Army:				
Interior.....	4,263	4,942	679		Inside continental United States.....	251,330	254,585	3,255	
State.....	390	401	11		Outside continental United States.....	27,524	28,124	600	
Treasury.....	9,075	8,634		441	Department of the Air Force:				
Independent agencies:					Inside continental United States.....	124,549	129,145	4,596	
Atomic Energy Commission.....	131	155	24		Outside continental United States.....	20,901	20,908	7	
General Services Administration.....	157	137		20	Department of the Navy:				
Panama Canal.....	1,586	1,512		74	Inside continental United States.....	279,386	280,633	1,247	
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	10,961	11,436	475		Outside continental United States.....	25,926	25,649		277
Total, excluding National Military Establishment.....	27,984	28,567	1,189	606	Total, National Military Establishment.....	729,616	739,044	9,705	277
Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment.....			583		Net increase, National Military Establishment.....			9,428	
					Grand total, including National Military Establishment.....	757,600	767,611	10,894	883
					Net increase, including National Military Establishment.....			10,011	

TABLE V.—Federal employees assigned to mutual defense assistance program

Department or agency	Payroll (in thousands)			Civilian personnel		
	In April was—	In May was—	Increase (+) decrease (—)	In May numbered—	In June numbered—	Increase (+) decrease (—)
Total.....	\$7,394	\$7,205	—\$189	23,915	22,828	—1,087
State Department.....	120	132	+12	247	279	+32
Economic Cooperation Administration.....	4	4		8	8	
Office of the Secretary of Defense.....	20	25	+5	46	47	+1
Department of the Army.....	5,802	5,797	—5	20,112	18,864	—1,248
Department of the Air Force.....	563	513	—50	1,529	1,821	+292
Department of the Navy.....	885	734	—151	1,973	1,809	—164

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government wound up the fiscal year in June with 2,486,765 civilian employees on the payroll and with a civilian payroll running at an annual rate of approximately \$8,500,000,000.

During the month of June the increase totaled 43,649, of whom 27,952 were civilian employees added by the Military Establishment and 15,697 by civilian agencies.

Among the civilian agencies principal increases were reported by the Department of Agriculture with 5,523, Interior Department with 3,260, Economic Stabilization Agency with 2,532, State Department with 1,374, Justice Department with 1,219, Tennessee Valley Authority with 747, General Services Administration with 678, and Federal Security Agency with 517. Major decreases were reported by the Veterans' Administration with 1,542 and the Treasury Department with 503.

HALF-MILLION INCREASE IN FISCAL YEAR

The increase during the year ending June 30 totaled 517,815, of whom 482,452 civilian employees were added to the Military Establishment and 35,363 by civilian agencies.

These figures were revealed today in the monthly compilation of personnel reports certified by the 70 reporting agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

LETTER FROM MRS. ROSENBERG

In connection with the increase in civilian employment by the Military Establishment, which during the year averaged more than 1,300 a day, I am today in receipt of the following letter from Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel:

Hon. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on
Nonessential Federal Expenditures,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am enclosing a copy of a Department of Defense directive which I know will be of interest to you. This directive is in line with our increased activities

for more effective utilization of military and civilian personnel, and incorporates the following major features:

1. Establishes a ceiling for all military and civilian personnel in departmental activities in the Washington area at the strengths actually on board on July 20, 1951. Included are the departmental activities of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force, as well as those in the various boards and activities supporting the Secretary of Defense.

2. Within the next 90 days, each military department and the agencies of the Office of the Secretary of Defense must achieve a 5-percent reduction in both military and civilian strengths within the departmental activities referred to above. These reductions will be accomplished through normal attrition or turnover, insofar as practicable, rather than through arbitrary reductions in force.

3. Military personnel will not be used to replace civilian personnel, nor shall we permit the intent of this directive to be circumvented by the use of temporary duty, detail of individuals from field activities (either within or outside of the Washington area), or by any similar actions.

In order to insure that any civilian personnel reductions be implemented in an honest and efficient manner, I should like to point out that the Secretaries of the military departments have been specifically charged with the responsibility of surveying their activities and effecting this reduction by selected activity, rather than across the board, and in a manner calculated to cause the minimum interference with essential activities. I have personally discussed this aspect with the Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff, and emphasized the necessity for making this cut in those activities where cuts would be least disruptive.

I wish to point out that the above step is, in my judgment, only the most recent evidence of the Department's sincere desire and continuing efforts to effect economy in the use of personnel. The savings in our end fiscal year 1951 civilian employment brought about by the establishment of manpower ceilings within the budgetary ceilings are an example of these efforts.

Striking evidence is also available respecting economy in the use of military personnel. Through improved utilization, the Army expects to obtain two or three more divisions than were originally planned without increasing its requested end fiscal year 1952 strength of 1,552,000.

I believe that these savings illustrate the Department's adherence to the principle that budgetary ceilings should not be thought of as floors, and that they should be treated as a limit, not a goal.

We will continue to exert every effort to achieve maximum economy in the use of all Defense Department personnel and we will appreciate your continuing interest and cooperation toward that end.

Sincerely yours,

ANNA M. ROSENBERG.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, August 9, 1951, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 1246. An act to amend certain laws relating to the submission of postmasters' accounts under oath, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to make the restrictions of the Federal Reserve Act on holding office in a member bank inapplicable to M. S. Szymczak when he ceases to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 1962. A bill for the relief of Henryka Czlenowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1963. A bill to provide for the national defense and for conservation and public development and beneficial public use of the undeveloped water power of Niagara Falls

and the Niagara River in the State of New York, in accordance with the provisions of the Niagara Redevelopment Treaty between the United States and Canada, ratified by the Senate of the United States on August 9, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1964. A bill for the relief of Winifred Phillips Wooten;

S. 1965. A bill for the relief of Salomia Fanea Mainescu; and

S. 1966. A bill for the relief of Michael Cosmo Zullo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1967. A bill to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. DUFF):

S. 1968. A bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HENDRICKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1969. A bill for the relief of Romildo Michele Vanin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1970. A bill for the relief of Louis E. Gabel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1971. A bill to establish a Commission on the Public Debt of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1972. A bill for the relief of Hakim Uddin, Arfan Ali, also known as Ali Arfan, Abdul Barik, Bashier Uddin, and Moklish Miah or Moklimis Moklesima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. NIXON):

S. 1973. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with reference to the building and construction industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. TAFT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 1974. A bill for the relief of Walter Huva and his wife, Lea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1975. A bill to permit the discharge by employers of persons who are members of organizations designated as subversive by the Attorney General of the United States, and to decertify labor organizations represented by or having officers who are members of such organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. NEELY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. PASMORE, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. DUFF, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. IVES, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 1976. A bill to provide home rule in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for Mr. SMATHERS):
S. 1977. A bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1978. A bill to prohibit members and employees of any national political committee from practicing before or attempting to influence the decision of any department or agency of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 1979. A bill for the relief of Helen Stempera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1980. A bill for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1981. A bill authorizing investigation, research, and development work by the Secretary of the Interior and the construction and operation of facilities, including not more than one demonstration plant, to determine and demonstrate the economic feasibility of producing electric power and energy by means of a wind-driven generator operated in conjunction with an electric power system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MURRAY when he introduced the last above-named bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPEL (for Mr. MARTIN):

S. 1982. A bill for the relief of Marietoula A. (Anthony) Georgas, A-6884470; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KERR, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. LANGER):

S. 1983. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. CAIN):

S. 1984. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 1985. A bill to provide for the education of the dependent minor children of the military and civilian personnel of the Federal Government stationed overseas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WHERRY (for Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1986. A bill to provide for extension of terms of patents where the use, exploitation, or promotion thereof was prevented, impaired, or delayed by causes due to war, national emergency, or other causes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEM (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. MALONE):

S. 1987. A bill providing for the termination of assistance to foreign countries exporting war materials to Russia or her satellites; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEM when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE—PENNSYLVANIA-NEW JERSEY COMPACT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1½ minutes as a preliminary to the introduction of a bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey? The Chair hears

none, and the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania have entered into a compact authorizing the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission and the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, acting alone or in conjunction with each other, to construct, finance, operate, and maintain a bridge across the Delaware River.

Under the Constitution—article I, section 10—the consent of Congress must be given to any compact entered into by two or more States. Accordingly together with my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], I introduce a bill which will grant the consent of Congress to the compact entered into between the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania. If approved, this bill will make possible a connection between the New Jersey Turnpike and the Pennsylvania Turnpike systems.

The bill contains reasonable safeguards necessary to protect the vital interests of the United States in the subject matter of this compact.

The advantages which will eventually flow from the early enactment of this proposed legislation, not only to the States involved but as well to the people of the entire Nation, are too numerous to mention at this time, so I will not labor the question today. I shall, however, have more to say on the subject before the committee to which the bill is referred and before the entire body when the bill has reached the floor of the Senate.

The bill (S. 1968) granting the consent of Congress to a compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning a bridge across the Delaware River to provide a connection between the Pennsylvania Turnpike system and the New Jersey Turnpike, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. DUFF), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT RELATING TO BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with reference to the building and construction industry. I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement with reference to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Ohio may proceed.

The bill (S. 1973) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with reference to the building and construction industry, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TAFT (for

himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. NIXON) was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the bill has been worked out by us with the building trades representatives of the American Federation of Labor. It deals particularly with the problem of elections in the building trades, which have been, for all practical purposes, impracticable under the terms of the Taft-Hartley law.

The bill, however, does something more. It is the result really of a request on the part of the building trades for a modification of the Wagner Act, because what they have desired, and what the bill provides, is that an agreement may be made by contractors with a building trade before the initiation of a job, and before, therefore, there are any employees who can vote to make any particular union a representative of those employees. The bill does not, however, provide for a closed shop. It provides for the same union shop which is provided for in the various terms of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. William Green, president, American Federation of Labor, to Mr. Richard J. Gray, president, building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor, endorsing the bill. I think it is significant, because many of the unions, and, up to this time, the Secretary of Labor himself, have taken the position that they would not back any amendment to the Taft-Hartley law because they would consider nothing but repeal. I think this represents a change in the general attitude, and I certainly welcome the position represented here in a desire to work out amendments and improvements in the law, in which certainly the building trades and other labor unions will receive my hearty cooperation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1951.

Mr. RICHARD J. GRAY,
President, Building and Construction
Trades Department, American Federation
of Labor, A. F. of L. Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: You will recall that you and your associates representing the building and construction trades department met with the executive council of the American Federation of Labor at the meeting held in Chicago, during the week of May 14, and requested the executive council to assist you and your associates to bring about an amendment to the Taft-Hartley law in order that the building and construction trades organizations might secure the same relief the railroad organizations are granted under the Railway Labor Act.

The executive council decided, after giving consideration to the information you submitted to the council and the report you made, to extend to the building and construction trades department whatever assistance it may find possible to give.

This is the official action of the executive council in response to the request for the extension of help and assistance to the build-

ing and construction trades department, as herein set forth.

Faternally yours,
WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of
Labor.

PROPOSED PRODUCTION OF ELECTRIC POWER AND ENERGY BY WIND-DRIVEN GENERATOR

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill authorizing investigation, research, and development work by the Secretary of the Interior and the construction and operation of facilities, including not more than one demonstration plant, to determine and demonstrate the economic feasibility of producing electric power and energy by means of a wind-driven generator operated in conjunction with an electric power system, and for other purposes. An identical bill, H. R. 4286, was introduced in the House of Representatives on May 28, 1951, by the Honorable JOHN R. MURDOCK, of Arizona.

I have prepared a brief statement concerning the proposed legislation, and ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1981) authorizing investigation, research, and development work by the Secretary of the Interior and the construction and operation of facilities, including not more than one demonstration plant, to determine and demonstrate the economic feasibility of producing electric power and energy by means of a wind-driven generator operated in conjunction with an electric power system, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURRAY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

There is an immediate need for additional energy, such as wind energy, for power purposes at various points in the country, rather urgent in some dry areas, where water is short in hydroelectric systems. It is highly important to note that, under many conditions, wind energy can be substituted for water energy. Fortunately the progress made with aerogenerators for producing electric power from the wind has reached such a stage that full-sized units may be built for permanent installations, subject only to a certain amount of preliminary design research in connection with the first unit.

The Bureau of Reclamation is greatly interested in the utilization of wind power as a supplementary source of electric energy. In an official publication issued last April after careful study of the question, the Bureau has stated:

"The Bureau of Reclamation's power systems located in the West are completely hydroelectric at the present time and in the near future will probably remain so, with the exception of additions of necessary supplemental power for firming purposes. Such supplemental energy is now supplied from non-Bureau fuel-electric plants. Development of financially and technically feasible aerogenerators for use in such systems is practicable and quite desirable because there

is no fuel cost involved in its operation. It now appears entirely reasonable, once specific designs are proved, for substantial quantities of electric energy to be generated by such generators properly located and absorbed into a power system so as to utilize to the best advantage the energy of the wind. These wind power plants would be used to furnish supplemental energy only as required by the Bureau power systems, thereby greatly augmenting the firm energy available from hydro power plants only. Such supplemental source of energy, even though noncontinuous, is economically desirable because wind power is not a limited energy source and the cost of operation does not include fuel costs. The problem in almost all parts of the West is that there is an inadequate supply of water to meet the needs of the people. Therefore supplemental supply of energy is a necessity and the most economical means of providing such supplemental energy to that produced by hydro plants should be adopted."

Because of the regulation of their rates by the Federal Power Commission, the private utilities are practically inhibited from taking up the installation of aerogenerators at this time, as all savings would lead only to equivalent reductions of rates, with all risk at the cost of the utilities. It seems that, with the object of adding a new and very low-cost source of electric energy, the greatly increased expense of the designing and the extensive testing of the first unit should be borne by some agency of the Government.

Some considerable development work on utilizing wind energy has been done in Europe, but they seem to be well behind the work done here.

After many years and a number of futile attempts with large-capacity wind turbines, a 1,000-kilowatt unit, designed along generally sound lines, was installed in the system of the Central Vermont Public Service Corp. on a small Vermont mountain named Grandpa's Knob, known as the Smith-Putnam wind turbine. This was a definite operational success, meeting the expected output, but, unfortunately, after being in service a few weeks an accident disabled a blade. As the design data sought by the engineering construction company which had put up the funds had already been obtained, the high cost of redesign of the blade was not warranted and the turbine was dismantled.

However, the successful operation of the Grandpa's Knob turbine was effective notice to the Federal Power Commission that aerogenerators were in the making; and a project was set up, under the Chief Engineer, to thoroughly investigate the potentialities of wind power as a source of utility energy and to make a study of the most feasible manner of weaving wind energy, with its peculiar lack of continuity, into our existing utility systems. From this study it appears that wind power, harnessed under suitable conditions, will conserve scarce water for the production of hydroelectric power and, at the same time, release for other essential uses much of the oil and coal now consumed by electric utility systems.

After some 8 years of research under the direction of Mr. Percy H. Thomas in the Office of the Chief Engineer, the Federal Power Commission issued three exhaustive monographs covering all phases of the project to utilize wind power for electric utility service. These, including a complete study design with all details of a 7,500-kilowatt aerogenerator, were offered to the public for the guidance of any who might desire to make use of wind power. This research resulted in two United States patents being obtained and assigned to the Federal Power Commission—one electrical and one mechanical—covering important features of its aerogenerator.

Mr. Thomas is a graduate in electrical engineering at Massachusetts Institute of

Technology. He has had some 58 years of experience since graduation in various phases of electric power work—manufacturing, operational, and design, together with many years of laboratory research—in both the United States and other countries. These include 10 years of engineering and research with the Westinghouse Electric Co. and 8 years as consulting electrical engineer for the firm of Guggenheim Bros., in charge of power for their Chilean and Bolivian mining enterprises. He is a fellow of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, a full member of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, has written many technical papers, and has held chairmanships of many of the technical and other committees of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers and other technical societies. He is the patentee of between 60 and 80 United States patents on varied subjects.

This proposal for developing supplementary electric energy from wind power holds great promise. Compared with the tremendous expenditures we are now making for defense, its cost would be infinitesimal. I hope that the Congress will proceed without unnecessary delay to authorize this project.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN OLD-AGE INSURANCE BENEFITS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to have a statement by me pertaining to the bill, which is a matter of increasing the old-age insurance benefits by \$5 a month, along with the tables which explain the formula and the changes as recommended in the bill, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and tables will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1983) to amend the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement and tables presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON HIS PROPOSAL TO INCREASE OLD-AGE INSURANCE BENEFITS BY \$5 PER MONTH

The bill which I have introduced with Senator LEHMAN, Senator KERR, and Senator LANGER provides for increasing Federal old-age and survivors insurance payments in a manner comparable to the increases to be made in the public assistance payments. In brief, the bill increases the insurance payments to retired workers now on the benefit rolls by \$5 per month, with corresponding increases for their eligible dependents. The bill also provides for increased payments to those who retire in the future and to the families of insured workers who die.

As you know, the Congress spent considerable time on our social-security programs last year. In its report on the Social Security Act amendments of 1950, the Senate Committee on Finance stated:

"Your committee's impelling concern in recommending passage of H. R. 6000, as revised, has been to take immediate, effective steps to cut down the need for further expansion of public assistance, particularly old-age assistance. Unless the insurance

system is expanded and improved so that it in fact offers a basic security to retired persons and to survivors, there will be continual and nearly irresistible pressure for putting more and more Federal funds into the less-constructive assistance programs. We consider the assistance method to have serious disadvantage as a long-run approach to the Nation's social-security problem. We believe that improvement of the American social-security system should be in the direction of preventing dependency before it occurs, and of providing more effective income protection, free from the humiliation of a test of need. Accordingly your committee recommends action designed to immediately bolster and extend the system of old-age and survivors insurance by extension of coverage, increasing benefit amounts, liberalizing eligibility requirements, and otherwise improving this basic system for dealing with income losses."

It seems abundantly clear to me that if the substitution of old-age and survivors insurance payments for public-assistance payments is to be carried forward in accordance with the intent of the 1950 amendments, as expressed in the foregoing quotation, the level of insurance payments must be increased to prevent their lag behind the cash grants available under the public-assistance programs. Since higher assistance grants are contemplated, an increase in old-age and survivors insurance payments is needed. At the present time, payments under the two programs are approximately equal. The gains thus far accomplished in establishing the insurance program as the basis of our social-security system must not be lost. The gains should not only be maintained but should be increased.

The bill embodies a very simple method of increasing the insurance payments now being made. It merely provides that current monthly payments to retired workers would be increased by \$5 so that the minimum is raised to \$25 a month. It also provides a simple method of increasing benefits payable to future beneficiaries by making a change in the method for computing benefits. The benefit formula is changed from 50 percent of the first \$100 of average monthly wage to 50 percent of the first \$115 of average monthly wage. The maximum family benefit is raised from \$150 per month to \$160, and the amount below which the total monthly family benefit would not be reduced by the maximum provisions is increased from \$40 to \$50.

The bill does not increase the monthly benefit payments for individuals who retire in the future with average monthly wages below \$100 if their benefits are computed under the new formula in the bill. There are several reasons for this. First, the man with average wages of \$100 received a monthly payment of \$25 under the previous law. Under the 1950 amendments his benefit was increased to \$50—an increase of 100 percent. The individual with average wages of \$200 who was receiving a benefit of \$35 under the previous law had his benefit raised to \$65—an increase less than the proportionate increase for the man with average wages under \$100. Second, wages have increased in recent years so that very few persons working entirely in covered employment will have average wages below \$100. Third, by increasing the coverage under the 1950 amendments, the average monthly wage of many persons was increased. Fourth, most persons with average monthly wages of under \$100 are persons who are in the insurance system only part of the time and their benefits should be raised by making coverage universal and by changing the method for computing the average wage.

Under the bill beneficiaries would receive their increased benefits promptly. Moreover, the increased insurance payments could be made immediately without changing the

contributions or the actuarial status of the system as calculated when the 1950 amendments were enacted. This is due to the fact that increased wages have resulted in an increase in the income to the trust fund that will be more than adequate in the long run to pay the increased benefits.

It was very gratifying to me to have reaffirmed last year through the hearings on social security that our great labor organizations, both the AFL and CIO, the United States Chamber of Commerce and our other great business organizations, State and Federal administrators, and other representatives of the public all joined together to favor the method of earned security, the method of contributory social insurance, as the way for us to prevent dependency and poverty in this country. The great mass of people of this country have indicated that they want the right to earn their security, to pay their own way, and to have the dignity and independence in old age which goes with an earned right. It is heartening indeed at this time of our struggle with totalitarian philosophies to find Americans united in their determination to end poverty at home—to end it in the American way by giving each man the opportunity, through our Federal insurance program, to earn his own security.

Through social insurance the prevention of insecurity is made an integral part of our whole wage system. As a man works he earns not wages alone but also the right to security through social insurance. The more a man works and the better he works the more he earns and the higher is his social-insurance benefit. This is the way the American people want it, and this is the answer to communistic charges that the democracies cannot protect their people against want.

I do not mean to imply that there is no need for improvement in our assistance program. I strongly support the proposal adopted by the Senate for increases in public assistance payments. I recognize fully that even the improved assistance and insurance programs cannot do the whole job. Our insurance program must be broadened and liberalized. Assistance payments will still be necessary for those who have unusual needs, for those who are in need for reasons not covered by the insurance program, and for those few who for one reason or another are not able to earn insurance protection through work. Assistance payments will continue to be necessary for children in need because of desertion by their father and for persons who are disabled.

Many of our workers today have been granted cost-of-living increases in wages. Yet our old people living on assistance payments and on insurance payments are required to meet the same costs of high living without increases in benefits. Surveys made by the Social Security Administration show that benefits provide most of the retirement income of old-age insurance beneficiaries. In other words, the great majority of the insurance beneficiaries had practically no cash income other than their insurance benefits, and despite the recent increases these benefits average only about \$43 a month.

Moreover, some of the beneficiaries are getting only \$20 or \$25 a month. Can anyone here say this is enough to live on today? Some of the beneficiaries owned their homes, but about half of the homes were mortgaged. Some beneficiaries were getting by because they also received benefits from public assistance. Many were partially dependent on their adult children and other relatives. A large number, however, just pulled in their belts and limited their meals to two a day.

Since benefits provide the chief source of retirement income for such a large proportion of beneficiaries, and since most of them have inadequate assets, an increase in benefit

income—both for recipients under the assistance program and the beneficiaries under the insurance program—is essential.

The logic of this position has already been pointed out by my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Senator TAFT, when he said here on the floor on June 26:

"If we are to increase the noncontributory payments, we ought to also increase the insurance payments. * * * I think that if one is to be increased, there ought to be a relative position between them, because obviously the contributory pension ought to be larger than the noncontributory pension." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7104.)

As the Senator pointed out, "the fund has brought in so much more money, under the increased tax and the very largely inflated payroll since Korea, that it is quite possible to make a larger payment on insurance, also, without increasing the tax."

I agree with the Senator, and I know he will give full support to this bill in the Finance Committee.

Under the bill we have proposed, nearly 4,000,000 insurance beneficiaries—about 2,500,000 old people, about 500,000 widows, and over 700,000 children—would have their insurance benefits increased. In my own State of Minnesota, for instance, over 60,000 beneficiaries would receive an additional \$4,000,000 in 1952. In New York State, about 450,000 old people, widows, and orphans would receive in the calendar year 1952 almost \$35,000,000 additional. In Oklahoma about 40,000 old people, widows, and orphans would receive in the calendar year 1952 almost \$2,500,000 additional. In Ohio about 250,000 old people, widows, and orphans would receive in the calendar year 1952 almost \$17,000,000 additional. In North Dakota about 5,000 old people, widows, and orphans would receive in the calendar year 1952 almost \$350,000 additional. Thus our amendment would be a step in the direction of permitting our old people to live a life of dignity and of maintaining the insurance program in its rightful place as our chief bulwark against insecurity.

A PROPOSAL TO INCREASE OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE BENEFITS BENEFIT FORMULA CHANGE

Change 50 percent of first \$100 of average monthly wage to 50 percent of first \$115 of average monthly wage. Raise from \$40 to \$50 the amount below which the total monthly family benefit will not be reduced by the maximum provisions; raise the maximum dollar amount payable on one wage record from \$150 to \$160.

INCREASE IN BENEFIT AMOUNT FOR THOSE WHOSE BENEFITS ARE BASED ON THE CONVERSION TABLE

Increase the primary insurance amount \$5 with comparable increases in the other benefit amounts—\$2.50 in wife's benefit, \$3.75 in widow's benefit, etc.

INCREASE IN DOLLAR EXPENDITURES IN CALENDAR YEAR 1952 AS A RESULT OF PROPOSED CHANGES

Under the present law the old-age and survivors insurance system will pay out \$2,200,000,000 in benefits during 1952.¹ The proposed changes would result in paying out an additional \$265,000,000, \$250,000,000 attributable to changes in the conversion table and \$15,000,000 attributable to changes in the benefit formula.

LEVEL-PREMIUM COST OF PROPOSED CHANGES

The proposed changes would have a level-premium cost of 0.5 percent of payrolls. Practically all of this increase is attributable

¹ Based on table 9 in S. Doc. 44, 82d Cong., 1st sess., "Eleventh Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund."

to the changes in the benefit formula. The increase in the level-premium cost as a result of the proposed increase to persons whose benefits are based on the conversion table would be about 0.03 percent of payrolls.

In summary, the immediate increase in dollar expenditures is largely the result of increasing benefits for those now on the rolls; the increase in the level-premium cost, on the other hand, is almost entirely the result of the proposed changes in the benefit formula.

EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED CHANGES ON THE ABILITY OF THE SYSTEM TO MEET COSTS UNDER THE PRESENT TAX SCHEDULE

At the time the 1950 amendments were being considered by Congress, the actuary to the committees estimated the level-premium cost of the present system to be 6.05 percent. The law provides a contribution schedule based on this estimate.

Because of the weighting in the benefit formula, the cost of the system measured as a percent of payrolls drops as wages rise. In arriving at the 6.05 percent figure, 1947 wage levels were used. The Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance estimates (attachment A) that average wages increased 15 percent from 1947 to 1950, and by 27 percent from 1947 to 1951.

Using 1950 wage levels instead of 1947 levels, but keeping all other actuarial assumptions the same, the level-premium cost of the present system would be 5.5 percent of payrolls. Using 1951 wage levels, the level-premium cost under the same assumptions would be about 5.3 percent.

The level-premium cost figures of 5.5 percent based on 1950 wage levels allows room for the proposed changes, costing 0.5 percent of payrolls, without any increase in the long-range cost over that contemplated in the 1950 amendments. Consequently, no change in the tax schedule is called for by these proposals.

Both the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee have recognized that the tax schedule in the act allows for increases in benefit amounts to keep up with increasing wages and that unless such increases are made, the rates in the statutory tax schedule will be too high.

The Senate Finance Committee stated:

"The estimates are based on level-wage assumptions (somewhat below the present level). If, in the future, the wage level should be considerably above that which now prevails, and if the benefits for those on the roll are at some time adjusted upward on this account, the increased outgo resulting will, in the same fashion, be offset. The cost estimates, however, have not taken into account the possibility of a rise in wage levels, as has consistently occurred over the past history of this country. If such an assumption were used in the cost estimates, along with the assumption that the benefits nevertheless would not be changed, the cost relative to payroll would naturally be lower." (S. Rept. 1669, 81st Cong., 2d sess., Social Security Act amendments of 1950, p. 34.)

The House Ways and Means Committee stated:

"If, in the future, the wage level should be considerably above that which now prevails, and if the benefits for those on the roll were at some time adjusted upward on this account, the increased outgo resulting will, in the same fashion, be far more than offset. The cost estimates, however, have not taken into account the possibility of a rise in wage levels, as has consistently occurred over the past history of this country. If such an assumption were used in the cost estimates, the cost relative to payroll would naturally be lower." (H. Rept. 1300, 81st Cong., 1st sess., Social Security Act amendments of 1949, p. 33.)

ATTACHMENT A

Estimated average annual wage credits on \$3,600 wage base—pre-1951 coverage under OASI¹

	All workers during year	Index (1947=100)
1947.....	\$1,657	100
1948.....	1,782	108
1949.....	1,805	109
1950.....	1,910	115
1951.....	2,100	127

¹ All estimates through 1950 are based on tabulations of OASI data; estimate for 1951 is based on a correlation between OASI average quarterly and annual earnings data and Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates of average weekly earnings in manufacturing and nonmanufacturing industries which are approximately equivalent to OASI coverage in 1950 or earlier. BLS average weekly earnings in covered industries have risen 12.1 percent from the first quarter 1950 to the first quarter 1951, regardless of the wage base. Adjustment to a \$3,600 wage base on the basis of past experience resulted in a 10.9 percent increase from 1950 to 1951 in estimated average annual creditable wages.

² Preliminary.

Source: Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, July 9, 1951.

INCREASE IN BENEFIT AMOUNTS FOR BENEFICIARIES ON THE ROLLS

For present beneficiaries, the old-age insurance benefit will be increased \$5, with comparable increases in other benefit amounts—\$2.50 in wife's benefit, \$3.75 in widow's benefit, and so forth. These increases would likewise apply to persons, coming on the beneficiary rolls in the future, whose benefits will also be based on the conversion table.

Old-age and survivors insurance—Effect of proposed changes on benefit payments,¹ calendar years 1952–55 and 1960

(In millions)

Calendar year	Present law	Increase resulting from proposals		
		Total	Conversion table	Benefit formula
1952.....	\$2,200	\$265	\$250	\$15
1953.....	2,450	285	240	45
1954.....	2,650	295	230	65
1955.....	2,850	305	220	85
1960.....	3,800	365	150	215

¹ (a) For persons whose benefits are based on the benefit formula, change 50 percent of first \$100 of average monthly wage to 50 percent of first \$115 of average monthly wage; (b) for persons whose benefits are based on the conversion table, the primary insurance amount will be increased by \$5, and comparable increase in other benefit amounts—\$2.50 in wife's benefit, \$3.75 in widow's benefit, etc.; (c) the 80 percent of average monthly wage family maximum provision will not operate to reduce total monthly family benefits payable on one wage record below \$50 (\$40 under present law); the maximum amount of family benefits payable on one wage record is increased from \$150 to \$160.

Illustrative OASI benefits under 2 formulas

TABLE 1.—RETIRED WORKER

Average monthly wage	Present formula, 50 percent of \$100; 15 percent of \$200	Proposed formula, 50 percent of \$115; 15 percent of \$185
\$50.....	\$25.00	\$25.00
\$100.....	50.00	50.00
\$150.....	57.50	62.80
\$200.....	65.00	70.30
\$250.....	72.50	77.80
\$300.....	80.00	85.30

TABLE 2.—RETIRED WORKER AND WIFE

\$50.....	\$37.50	\$37.50
\$100.....	75.00	75.00
\$150.....	86.30	94.20
\$200.....	97.50	105.50
\$250.....	108.80	116.70
\$300.....	120.00	128.00

Illustrative OASI benefits under 2 formulas—Continued

TABLE 3.—WIDOW AND 2 CHILDREN

Average monthly wage	Present formula, 50 percent of \$100; 15 percent of \$200	Proposed formula, 50 percent of \$115; 15 percent of \$185
\$50.....	¹ \$40.00	² \$50.00
\$100.....	¹ \$80.00	¹ \$80.00
\$150.....	¹ 115.00	¹ 120.00
\$200.....	¹ 130.00	¹ 140.80
\$250.....	¹ 145.00	¹ 155.70
\$300.....	¹ 150.00	¹ 160.00

TABLE 4.—WIDOW AND 3 CHILDREN

\$50.....	¹ \$40.00	² \$50.00
\$100.....	¹ \$80.00	¹ \$80.00
\$150.....	¹ 120.00	¹ 120.00
\$200.....	¹ 150.00	¹ 160.00
\$250.....	¹ 150.00	¹ 160.00
\$300.....	¹ 150.00	¹ 160.00

¹ Reduced to 80 percent of average monthly wage.

² Proposed irreducible family benefit is \$50.

³ Reduced to present \$150 maximum.

⁴ Reduced to proposed \$160 maximum.

Old-age and survivors insurance, estimates of benefit payments under present law and increase in benefit payments under proposed revisions,¹ by State, calendar year 1952

[In millions]

State	Benefit payments under present law	Additional payments resulting from proposals
Total.....	\$2,200.0	² \$265.0
Alabama.....	25.6	3.1
Arizona.....	8.2	1.0
Arkansas.....	12.9	1.6
California.....	183.2	22.0
Colorado.....	16.6	2.0
Connecticut.....	47.2	5.7
Delaware.....	5.3	.6
District of Columbia.....	8.2	1.0
Florida.....	45.9	5.5
Georgia.....	24.7	3.0
Idaho.....	5.8	.7
Illinois.....	147.0	17.6
Indiana.....	62.3	7.5
Iowa.....	26.3	3.2
Kansas.....	19.1	2.3
Kentucky.....	28.8	3.5
Louisiana.....	21.2	2.6
Maine.....	19.0	2.3
Maryland.....	30.8	3.7
Massachusetts.....	113.5	13.7
Michigan.....	101.7	12.3
Minnesota.....	34.6	4.2
Mississippi.....	9.8	1.2
Missouri.....	52.3	6.3
Montana.....	6.7	.8
Nebraska.....	10.8	1.3
Nevada.....	2.2	.3
New Hampshire.....	12.0	1.4
New Jersey.....	98.4	11.8
New Mexico.....	3.8	.5
New York.....	274.8	33.0
North Carolina.....	28.7	3.5
North Dakota.....	2.7	.3
Ohio.....	146.0	17.6
Oklahoma.....	18.6	2.2
Oregon.....	28.2	3.4
Pennsylvania.....	210.0	25.3
Rhode Island.....	19.3	2.3
South Carolina.....	13.9	1.7
South Dakota.....	3.7	.4
Tennessee.....	25.6	3.1
Texas.....	56.5	6.8
Utah.....	7.3	.9
Vermont.....	6.3	.8
Virginia.....	30.4	3.7
Washington.....	44.3	5.3
West Virginia.....	30.7	3.7
Wisconsin.....	51.1	6.2
Wyoming.....	2.6	.3
Alaska, etc.....	15.4	1.8

¹ (a) For persons whose benefits are based on the benefit formula, change 50 percent of first \$100 of average monthly wage to 50 percent of first \$115 of average monthly wage; (b) for persons whose benefits are based on the conversion table, the primary insurance amount will be increased by \$5, and comparable increases in other benefit amounts—\$2.50 in wife's benefit, \$3.75 in widow's benefit, etc.; (c) the 80 percent of average monthly wage family maximum provision will not operate to reduce total monthly benefits payable on 1 wage record below \$50 (\$40 under present law); the maximum dollar amount of family benefits payable on one wage record is increased from \$150 to \$160.

² Represents \$250,000,000 attributable to changes in conversion table, and \$15,000,000 to the change in the benefit formula.

Selected comparative data for old-age and survivors insurance benefits and old-age assistance

End of—	Number of persons age 65 and over receiving—		Average monthly amount paid	
	OASI ¹	Old-age assistance	OASI retired worker	Old-age assistance
1950—August (old law).....	2,143,000	2,805,000	\$26.36	\$43.74
September.....	2,198,000	2,810,000	46.62	43.79
December.....	2,608,000	2,769,000	43.86	43.31
1951—April.....	2,946,000	2,743,000	42.90	43.07
May.....	3,004,000	2,755,000	42.73	43.17

¹ After August 1950, includes a relatively small number of wives under age 65 with child beneficiaries in their care.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 700. An act for the relief of Dora Jenny Wagner;

H. R. 804 An act for the relief of Sisters Maria DeRubertis, Agnese Cerina, Marianna Bonifacio, Dina Bonini, and Edvige Gasparrini;

H. R. 1252. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Miroslav Kudrat;

H. R. 1265. An act for the relief of Zora Novacek, Daniela Novacek, and Frantisek Novacek;

H. R. 1413. An act for the relief of Franz Geylling;

H. R. 1463. An act for the relief of David Lee Harrigan;

H. R. 1672. An act for the relief of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association;

H. R. 1831. An act to admit Luigi Morelli to the United States for permanent residence;

H. R. 1911. An act for the relief of Chikako Shishikura;

H. R. 2165. An act for the relief of Matthew Terry;

H. R. 2307. An act for the relief of Jean (John) Plewniak and Anna Piotrowska Plewniak;

H. R. 2444. An act for the relief of James A. Vines;

H. R. 2503. An act for the relief of Maria Rosa Bardales Arias;

H. R. 2505. An act for the relief of Carl Weitlanner;

H. R. 2621. An act for the relief of Mrs. Giulia Di Gaetano Coccia;

H. R. 3504. An act for the relief of Nison Miller;

H. R. 3965. An act for the relief of five sisters of the Franciscan Missionaries of Mary;

H. R. 4121. An act for the relief of Rafael Alemany;

H. R. 4127. An act for the relief of Mrs. Doris Ellen Young;

H. R. 4403. An act for the relief of Nadine Carol Heslip;

H. R. 4693. An act to amend section 77, subsection (c) (3), of the Bankruptcy Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2821. An act to enact certain provisions now included in the Defense Appropriation Act and the Civil Functions Appropriation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3830. An act to authorize the construction and equipment of a geomagnetic station for the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3838. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett;

H. R. 3840. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig; and

H. R. 4288. An act granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4674. An act authorizing the Secretary of State to continue Herve J. L'Heureux to serve as Chief of the Visa Division for an additional year commencing September 1, 1951; and

H. J. Res. 281. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim a special period for intensified voluntary contributions of clothing and kindred supplies in connection with the collection effort of American Relief for Korea, Inc.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 111) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Statement prepared by him regarding the annual Homecoming Day celebration of the Oxford Presbyterian Church in Rockbridge County, Va., on Sunday, August 5, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address entitled "Responsibility in the Press and in Politics," delivered by Senator KEFAUVER at the annual banquet of the Press Club of Oregon on August 4, 1951, in Portland, Ore.

Article entitled "State Department Budget Slash by House Is Not Wise," written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, and published in the Washington Daily News of July 31, 1951, and an editorial entitled "Trimming the U. N.," published in the Washington Post of July 27, 1951.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Address entitled "Aluminum and National Defense," delivered by W. Stuart Symington, Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, at Jonesville, Ark., on July 20, 1951.

By Mr. BYRD:

Fourth of July address delivered in 1941 by James Montgomery, son of a veteran of the Revolutionary War.

By Mr. WELKER:

Editorial entitled "BENTON Does a Favor for the Republicans," published in the Washington Times-Herald of August 9, 1951.

By Mr. IVES:

Editorial entitled "This Is Achesonism," published in the New York World-Telegram and the Sun of August 1, 1951, referring to conditions in the State Department.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Article entitled "Try Stampede Tactics To Get Way With Pick Flood-Control Plan," from the Overbrook (Kans.) Citizen of July 26, 1951.

Article entitled "Kansas University Engineering Professor for a Retention Dam System," written by Prof. J. O. Jones, professor of hydraulics at Kansas University, in opposition to the Army engineers' proposed Tuttle Creek Dam in Kansas.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article entitled "Dog Days for Congressmen," written by Marquis Childs and published in the Washington Post of August 7, 1951.

By Mr. WILEY:

Reply from Nikolai Shvernik, president of the Soviet Presidium, to Secretary of State Acheson regarding the Friendship Resolution, with resolution of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R., and editorial comment.

By Mr. KEM:

Editorial entitled "Low Estate of Public Morals," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 6, 1951.

By Mr. SCHOEPPPEL:

Editorial entitled "Situation Uncertain," published in the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital of August 6, 1951.

Editorial entitled "Who's a Liberal?" from the Washington Post of August 8, 1951.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Article entitled "Purpose of Stunt Is Achieved," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Star, referring to congressional immunity.

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

Article regarding proposed construction of power dam at Roanoke Rapids, N. C., written by James H. Pou Bailey and published in the Catawba News-Enterprise of July 20, 1951.

By Mr. HOEY:

Editorial entitled "The Power Is What Counts," from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News, relating to the proposed construction of a dam on the Roanoke River at Roanoke Rapids, N. C.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Accounts quoting resolutions by the Overseas Press Club and the American Newspaper Publishers' Association regarding the imprisonment in Czechoslovakia of Associated Press Correspondent William N. Oatis.

NOTICE BY SENATOR LODGE OF FURTHER REPORT ON EUROPEAN TRIP

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I give notice that on Monday next I shall seek recognition in order to report further information which I obtained, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, on the recent trip to Europe. It has a direct bearing on the international situation, and particularly on the foreign assistance legislation which is soon to come before the Senate.

THE WEST POINT CONTROVERSY

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey may proceed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yesterday in response to telegrams from Col. Harrison G. Travis, retired, United States Army, and other parents from New Jersey, I telegraphed them as follows:

Be advised I am placing at disposal of your son and other cadets from New Jersey concerned in honor violations my legislative counsel, Joseph W. Levy, lieutenant colonel, JAGC Reserve, whose services, counsel, and advice are available at your command. Feel confident that fair and impartial treatment will be assured. Am convinced from facts disclosed thus far that situation requires most thorough review by all appropriate authorities to end that final action may be tempered with highest quality of justice.

It must be clear to anyone who reads the full text of my telegram that I have formed no final conclusions on the issues

involved in the West Point controversy in placing at the disposal of the cadets from New Jersey, a member of my staff experienced in the field of military justice. My sole purpose was to assure them, as well as myself, that they would have impartial counsel and advice which might prevent them from pursuing any course which would prejudice either their rights or the interests of the military services.

I have specifically instructed Colonel Levy, who will be acting strictly in my behalf, to refrain from making any commitments which might involve the future course which I, in good conscience, may be called upon to pursue.

As my telegram indicates, I have every confidence that the ultimate solution of this most unfortunate situation, will be in accordance with those high principles of justice to which good Americans everywhere are dedicated.

It is quite clear from the facts disclosed thus far that the situation which has developed at the United States Military Academy requires a most thorough review by all appropriate authorities. Hasty, impulsive, and premature action in a matter which affects so many people can serve no good end, but can well destroy useful lives in which our country has so great an investment.

I shall reserve my judgment until all of the issues involved have been properly determined under standards which reflect the highest quality of justice.

SENATOR TOBEY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am sure that every Member of the Senate is sorry to learn that the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] will not be able to resume his duties in this Chamber for several weeks because, under the orders of his physicians, he is recuperating from a recent illness.

During the years the Senator from New Hampshire has been a Member of this body he has performed extremely conscientious service. He has always been exceedingly sympathetic toward those who have been in need of help. He served as a member of the Kefauver committee, and attracted the attention of millions of people throughout the United States. As a result of that service, he was in very great demand as a speaker in various parts of the country, and complied with those demands to such an extent that undoubtedly his health was affected by it.

One of his addresses was delivered before the Detroit Television Council on June 26, 1951. At that time he was introduced to the council by Mr. Harry Bannister.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Bannister's introduction of the Senator from New Hampshire printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the introduction was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION TO SENATOR TOBEY—DETROIT TELEVISION COUNCIL LUNCHEON JUNE 26, 1951

We all cherish pleasant memories of certain books and one of my favorites is Ben Hur, which you'll recall builds up to two

great climaxes. One, the chariot race, and the other, when the mother and sister of Ben Hur are cured of their leprosy through the supernatural power of our Lord.

This power to heal the sick has often been attributed to mere mortal men, though men in high position. The Roman historian, Tacitus, cites several cases, with elaborate details, when the Emperor Vespasian cured the sick merely by laying his hands on the afflicted. Another ancient, Appollonius of Tyana, was credited with the same power to cure sickness, in several well-documented instances.

While I personally am a skeptic, and believe in very little, I'm nevertheless willing to go along with a miracle, as long as I know what gives. Having enjoyed an unrivaled opportunity to watch our guest and speaker, Senator TOBEY, do his stuff on television, I'm ready to take a chance.

So, if there is anyone in the house who is afflicted with leprosy, if such a one will come forward now, I'll speak to the Senator and maybe he'll give us a demonstration in miracles. For a few paltry dollars, with lunch included, what have you got to lose?

What, no takers? A roomful of advertising people and no lepers.

When they asked me to introduce today's guest and speaker, I accepted with alacrity, which you'll remember is what the quick brown fox jumped over the lazy dog with. "Why" said I to myself "Senator TOBEY is my pal. Hadn't I watched him on television, for days on end. And didn't I, along with 20,000,000 other Americans, regard him as the keeper of our national conscience—a reincarnation of John the Baptist, always throwing the Good Book at the crooks and racketeers. Sure, I'd introduce him. I'd love to."

But, when I dug into the subject, pored over newspaper clippings, thumbed through Who's Who and Current Biography, I wasn't so sure but what I had bitten off more than I could chew.

Let me tell you something. This Senator from New Hampshire is a character, in the fullest sense of the word. He practically defies classification. He's totally unpredictable, and one never knows for sure how he will react to any given set of circumstances.

Let me cite you just a few of the contradictory facets of this amazing man. First, he's not a big fellow, as you'll see in a minute or so, but when he warms up to a subject, he grows and expands in stature until he gives off an impression of being gigantic. Once, an uncompromising isolationist, he now is one of the most advanced men in Government, in his world outlook. A stout opponent of the New Deal and everything it stood for, yet no one has consistently shown more concern for the victims of injustice and economic oppression. Blessed with a highly classical education, he loves to interlard his conversation with learned literary allusions, but the next moment he's apt to do a take-off on Senator Claghorne, in rich southern accents, with gestures. As he himself once said, in a tense moment during a heated verbal exchange with an ex-mayor of one of our eastern communities "I came into public life a poor man, and I'm still poor. But, I'm a freeman." And believe me, he is. If it were ever truly said of anyone that he wears no man's collar, it can be said of CHARLES W. TOBEY.

A strict prohibitionist, he has always been a teetotaler, out of step with the pattern of those who drink wet and vote dry. I'm told that his favorite dish is strawberry ice-cream, a rather incongruous diet for one who has made such a reputation as a fire-eater.

They say that no man is a hero to his valet, and that goes for those close to him. It's hard to fool those who know you well, and it should carry unusual significance that in the small town of Temple, N. H., where Senator TOBEY lives, all of the 141 registered voters once cast their votes for him.

I hope that with these random kaleidoscopic shots I have transmitted to you the picture of a terrific guy, because he is that, indeed.

So, without further ado, I give you now, that scourge of the evil-doer, that modern Ajax defying the lightning, the Sir Galahad of the coaxial cable, the indomitable Senator from the sovereign State of New Hampshire, the Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY. Senator TOBEY.

HARRY BANNISTER.

SHOWING OF FILM OF RECENT FLOOD DISASTER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Senate, Mr. Biffle, has arranged for the showing of a film on the recent flood disaster in Kansas, in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building this afternoon at 4 o'clock. Members of the Senate, members of their staffs, and, of course, friends, are invited. They are very splendid films. They were taken by the television studio of the Kansas City Star. One film was recently shown over a Nation-wide television network. Another film is a new one. It is entitled "The Aftermath." I urge Members of the Senate and others who can do so to attend the showing of the pictures this afternoon at 4 o'clock in the Senate Office Building.

DISMISSAL OF DR. RALPH BRIMLEY FROM EDUCATIONAL COMMISSION TO JAPAN

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I called the attention of the Senate last Monday to the dismissal of Dr. Ralph Brimley, of Winston-Salem, N. C., the very able county superintendent of schools of Forsyth County, from the educational mission to Japan after he had been appointed, without his solicitation, by the Army. The American Federation of Labor procured his dismissal because it disliked his views on the question of teachers joining labor unions.

I placed in the RECORD my full correspondence with General Marshall and Secretary Pace, in which the Army denied dictation from any pressure groups. If General Marshall does not know that the Army was dictated to in this instance then he is the only one who has been misled. The representatives of the American Federation of Labor rather boastfully admitted in the press that Brimley was dismissed upon its demand because of its objection to his labor views. This whole thing makes a rather sorry chapter and reflects upon the independence and freedom of the Army.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, following my remarks, a very splendid editorial from the Washington Evening Star of August 8, 1951, entitled "Army Double Talk."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY DOUBLE TALK

Senator HOEY, of North Carolina, has brought to light an incident which, to put it

mildly, reflects no credit on the Defense Department.

The incident is one of those things that ordinarily would attract little or no attention. Some weeks ago the Army asked a Winston-Salem public-school official, Dr. Ralph Brimley, to serve as a member of an education commission to Japan. Dr. Brimley had not sought that assignment but he accepted. Then, on July 6, he was informed that his name had been dropped from the list.

On its face, this was a trivial affair, hardly worthy of notice. But Senator HOEY wanted to know why his Winston-Salem constituent had been dropped from the commission, and he wrote to General Marshall for information. The replies that he received from General Marshall and from Army Secretary Pace were something less than full and forthright.

It seems that Dr. Brimley once made a talk to school teachers in his county advising them to use the grievance committee of their own education association instead of forming a separate union of teachers. According to Senator HOEY, the American Federation of Labor took exception to this and was able to have Dr. Brimley dropped from the commission being formed to carry the light to the Japanese.

General Marshall, while leaving the burden of the reply to Secretary Pace, denied that the Department of Defense accepts dictation from pressure groups. He did not deny, however, that the tilt with the AFL was the reason for Dr. Brimley's removal.

Mr. Pace was more elaborate, but less direct. He pointed out that the individuals selected for the mission to Japan must be acceptable to the educators, students, and citizens of that country. Dr. Brimley, he went on appears to be involved in a controversy which could well make itself felt in Japan, and therefore he was removed from the list.

If that is not unadulterated nonsense, then nothing is. It could only make sense if one were willing to assume that the people of Japan knew about or would care about the fact that Dr. Brimley had made a talk which irked the AFL. Of course the Japanese people never heard of the matter, and probably would not give it a second thought if they did.

In his letter to Senator HOEY, Mr. Pace said the Army believes the education commission to Japan serves as one of the best means of indoctrinating the people of Japan in the ways of democracy as understood in the United States.

That could be interpreted as meaning that the Army has found another way of wasting the taxpayers' money. But if the statement be taken at face value there is certainly room for doubt as to the helpfulness of the indoctrination that the people of Japan are getting in the ways of democracy as understood in the United States.

Mr. Pace's letter is double talk. There is little doubt that Senator HOEY was right in saying that Dr. Brimley was dropped, not for fear of offending the Japanese, but to appease the AFL. Mr. Pace's evasiveness does not set a good example for the Japanese of the workings of American democracy. Neither does it set a good example for the boys at West Point who are expected to adhere to the highest standard of candor and forthrightness.

SEVENTY-FIFTH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF SENATOR MCCARRAN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday one of our most distinguished Members observed his seventy-fifth milestone. The senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] received, I know, good wishes not only from countless folks

throughout his State, but from people throughout the Nation.

These 75 years have been full of tremendous activity and achievement on his part. In many roles our colleague has served with great distinction his State and Nation.

Here in this great body, there is none to doubt that the senior Senator from Nevada is a man with the courage of his convictions, a man who is ready, willing, and eager to give his all to the ideals which he holds.

I, for one, have had the pleasure of observing him at close-hand in the course of many years of our service on the Senate Judiciary Committee. I have served him as his ranking minority Member; and during the Eightieth Congress, I served as his chairman. I have always marveled at his amazing ability to get things done—to handle the widest variety of tasks, which he has always taken cheerfully on his shoulders, and which he has acted upon expeditiously.

I admire his many talents, his courage, his sincere devotion to his State and Nation. I have differed with him at times, and there no doubt will be occasions when I shall differ with him in the future; but that does not alter for one moment the very high esteem which I hold for him. I wish for him many more years of continued good health and happiness in continued service to his country.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

(a) A statistical story of precisely what the Senate Judiciary Committee has been accomplishing during this Eighty-second Congress. While we are but one of over a dozen Senate committees, we have invariably carried far more than one-third of the legislative work load of the Senate. The statistics of this report will, I am sure, be of deep interest especially to those who have occasionally or frequently criticized the Congress or its committees of being dilatory. The Judiciary Committee and its staff I believe can be rightly proud of their diligence.

(b) Secondly, I ask unanimous consent for the reproduction of the article carried in the American Bar Association Journal written by our colleague from Nevada, with regard to the important loyalty program—a subject in which he has been so tremendously interested, particularly because of his distinguished work on the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Internal Security.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS ABOUT THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

The workload of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the Eighty-second Congress, as of July 31, 1951, consisted of 48.3 percent of all Senate bills and resolutions introduced; 62.5 percent of all House bills and resolutions presented in the Senate; and 50.8 percent of all bills and resolutions irrespective of origin.

Not only has the Judiciary Committee received a far larger share of the Senate's total workload than any other standing committee of the Senate; it has also performed a larger share of all committee work than any other committee. Of 601 written reports

filed in the Senate by all committees, the Judiciary Committee has filed 336, which represents 56 percent.

The total of reports filed to the Senate does not give the whole picture of committee activity, because committee consideration of many bills resulted in adverse action and indefinite postponement. Furthermore, the committee has handled and disposed of more than 3,319 individual immigration cases, involving suspension of deportation, and 621 cases involving adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended. Each case is equivalent to a bill.

Through July 31, 1951, during the Eighty-second Congress, the Judiciary Committee has received 1,084 Senate bills and resolutions, and 296 House bills and resolutions, making a total of 1,380 bills and resolutions.

As of July 31, 1951, the committee had disposed of 431 Senate bills and resolutions, and 232 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 663 bills and resolutions.

Committee approval was granted to 186 Senate bills and resolutions, 151 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 337 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

(It will be noted that written reports were filed by the committee with respect to all but 1 of the 337 bills and resolutions approved.)

Bills postponed indefinitely by the committee included 245 Senate bills and resolutions, 81 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 326 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Measures pending before the committee as of July 31, 1951, included 653 Senate bills and resolutions, 64 House bills and resolutions, or a total of 717 bills and resolutions of both Houses.

Committee action, in most cases, must await reports from interested departments and agencies in the executive branch. As of July 31, 1951, the number of bills and resolutions pending before the committee, with respect to which reports have been requested, but not received, was 469.

Out of 1,380 bills and resolutions referred to the committee, the number of cases in which the committee has not acted but in which the committee either had received the reports or deemed reports unnecessary, totaled only 248.

The committee has disposed of 232 House bills and resolutions, out of 296 such measures referred to it, leaving only 64 House bills and resolutions pending as of July 31, 1951. This means the committee took action on 78.3 percent of all House measures received.

In comparison, out of 1,084 Senate bills and resolutions referred to it, the committee acted upon 431, leaving 653 Senate bills and resolutions pending. This means that although the committee had to "start from scratch" in all such cases, action was taken on 39.6 percent of all Senate measures received.

Suspensions of deportation by the Attorney General, and adjustments of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended, are, under authority delegated by the Congress, reported to the Congress in groups; but in the committee, each such individual case requires separate investigation, appraisal, and action. At the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, there were pending in the committee 2,761 cases of suspension of deportation, to which were added 5,356 additional cases submitted since the beginning of the Congress, making a total of 8,117 cases, of which 3,319 were approved, 341 were held for further consideration, 26 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, leaving a total of 4,431 cases "in process" as of July 31, 1951.

At the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress, there were pending 845 cases of

adjustment of status under section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, to which were added 1,103 additional cases submitted during this Congress, making a total of 1,948 cases, of which 621 were approved, and 7 were withdrawn by the Attorney General, leaving 1,320 cases in process as of July 31, 1951.

Through July 31, 1951, the committee received 73 executive nominations, all of which have been acted upon except 15.

THE SUPREME COURT AND THE LOYALTY PROGRAM: THE EFFECT OF REFUGEE COMMITTEE VERSUS MCGRATH

(By PAT MCCARRAN, United States Senator from Nevada)

Confusion may not be a necessary incident of judicial prolixity, but neither is it an unknown consequence. More often, however, misunderstanding is attributable to inattention as the growing complexity of modern life progressively forecloses opportunity for careful study of important judicial pronouncements as well as the other important developments of the day.

Editorial writers and columnists valiantly seek to overcome this diffusion of attention by capsuling information on these developments for public consumption. Their interpretation of the doctrines and effects of important Supreme Court decisions seems to be constantly improving in quality and in its approach to correctness, and there seems no reason to anticipate that this improvement will not continue indefinitely.

However, it sometimes occurs that the gentlemen of the press are confused by a judicial enunciation, perhaps because of its prolixity. In such a situation it is an interesting speculation whether their misunderstanding engenders or merely reflects public confusion. Of course, those who gain their only knowledge of a decision from confused, inaccurate, or distorted newspaper reports or analyses cannot escape some confusion in their own minds. Unfortunately, their number includes at least some lawyers who are too busy to read the case and must therefore depend upon their daily newspaper for a report of the decision.

When such a situation develops and particularly if an important ruling of our highest court is involved, the comments born out of reaction serve only to spread misapprehension concerning the true import of the decision. It is in such circumstances that the bar has a notable opportunity to perform a worthy public service in combating the public misapprehension. But this requires, of course, that our lawyers first inform themselves fully and accurately.

LOYALTY-LIST CASE SHOWS CONFUSION

In the brief period following the decision of the Supreme Court in Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee against McGrath, Attorney General,¹ much press and radio comment in public and even some semiofficial comment, in private, have indicated considerable confusion as to the exact result effected by that decision.

This case concerns the Government's loyalty program. It comes at a time when internal-security problems are attaining ever-increasing importance. As lawyers, there-

¹ 19 U. S. Law Week 4232 (April 30, 1951). This decision also comprises National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, Inc., against McGrath, Attorney General, and International Workers Order, Inc., and Arthur Lowndes Drayton against McGrath, Attorney General; these three cases arose separately but were consolidated for hearing before the Supreme Court. However, insofar as this article is concerned reference to the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee is intended to refer generally to all the petitioners, since the facts and the issue raised in the several cases are substantially the same.

fore, we are justified in seeking to learn and to make known the true import of the decision reached by the Supreme Court.

Our task is complicated somewhat by the fact that five separate and diverse opinions were written by the five Justices comprising the majority of the Court.²

To obtain perspective for consideration of this decision we must, therefore, briefly review the background of the case. On March 21, 1947, the President promulgated Executive Order 9835,³ which, culminating earlier but generally ineffective efforts to prevent disloyal persons from either obtaining or retaining Government employment, directed a loyalty investigation of every person employed by or entering the employment of any department or agency of the executive branch of the Federal Government. This order recited that it was based upon authority vested in the President by the Constitution and legislation,⁴ and upon the authority of the President as Chief Executive of the United States, in the interests of the internal management of the Government. It provided for the establishment of the Loyalty Review Board, within the Civil Service Commission, to supervise and coordinate the loyalty program and to hear appeals emanating from subordinate loyalty boards of the employing department or agency.

Part III, section 3, of the Executive order provided as follows:

"3. The Loyalty Review Board shall currently be furnished by the Department of Justice the name of each foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons which the Attorney General, after appropriate investigation and determination, designates as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of Government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

"(a) The Loyalty Review Board shall disseminate such information to all departments and agencies."

By letter of November 24, 1947, which was disseminated to all the executive departments and agencies, the Attorney General furnished the Loyalty Review Board with a list of subversive organizations pursuant to part III, section 3, of Executive Order 9835. This list included a designation of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.⁵

² The controlling opinion was written by Mr. Justice Burton, joined only by Mr. Justice Douglas, who also wrote a concurring opinion. Individual opinions were presented by Mr. Justice Black, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, and Mr. Justice Jackson, all of whom agreed with the result of the controlling opinion but on different grounds. In addition, Mr. Justice Reed wrote a dissenting opinion, with the concurrence of the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Minton.

³ 12 Fed. Reg. 1935 (1947), 3 Cod. Fed. Regs. 129 (Supp. 1947), 5 U. S. C. A. sec. 631 note.

⁴ Specifically including the Civil Service Act of 1883, 22 Stat. 403, as amended, and sec. 9A of the Hatch Act, approved Aug. 2, 1939, 53 Stat. 1148, 18 U. S. C. sec. 611 (1946), now 5 U. S. C. sec. 118j (1946, Supp. III).

⁵ Several months later, on September 17, 1948, the Attorney General furnished the Loyalty Review Board with a consolidated list containing the names of all the organizations designated by him as within Executive Order 9835, segregated according to the classifications enumerated in pt. III, sec. 3 of the order, on the basis of dominant characteristics; each of the three organizations involved herein were classified in this consolidated list as Communist. See 13 Fed. Reg. 6137-8, 5 Code Fed. Regs. c. 11, pt. 210, pp. 203-5 (1949).

Subsequently the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee filed a suit in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia primarily to have Executive Order 9835 declared unconstitutional as applied against that organization. The relief sought by complainant was to have its name deleted from the allegedly unconstitutional list because of the obvious harm to the activities of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee by reason of its designation by the Attorney General as subversive and Communist. The complainant described the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a charitable organization engaged in relief work and generally implied an attitude of cooperation and helpfulness, rather than one of hostility or disloyalty, on the part of the organization toward the United States, although the complaint did not state an express denial that the Refugee Committee is subject to the designation made by the Attorney General.

The District Court granted defendant's motion to dismiss the complaint for its failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, and denied the complainant's motion for a preliminary injunction, without opinion, on June 4, 1948. The United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia circuit affirmed the order of dismissal, one judge dissenting.⁶ The Supreme Court granted certiorari because of the importance of the issues and their relation to the Government's loyalty program.⁷

ISSUE DECIDED BY COURT WAS VERY NARROW

It is essential, then, to note that the sole issue before the Supreme Court, raised by the dismissal of the complaint for failure to state a cause of action upon which relief could be granted, was whether, in the face of the facts alleged in the complaint and therefore admitted by the motion to dismiss, the Attorney General of the United States had authority to include the complaining organization in a list of organizations designated by him as subversive and Communist and furnished by him to the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission. This issue was decided in the negative and the Supreme Court merely ruled that the case should be remanded to the District Court with instructions to deny respondent's motion to dismiss the complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

To state the matter more simply, the Supreme Court held only that the petitioner was entitled to an opportunity to substantiate the allegations stated in its complaint, i. e., to have the case tried on its facts.

This holding leaves open the clear possibility that the District Court may find that the Attorney General's listing of that organization as subversive and Communist was justified on the facts and was neither arbitrary nor capricious nor unreasonable in the light of the procedure actually followed in making the determination resulting in that designation.

The ruling of the Supreme Court in this case does not produce the result, contrary to the expressions or the implications contained in various commentaries on the decision, that the Government's loyalty program must be scrapped nor does it mean that revision is compulsory for the procedure followed by the Attorney General in listing subversive organizations pursuant to the mandate of Executive Order 9835.

Certain language appears in the controlling opinion written by Mr. Justice Burton which

would tend to indicate a determination that the Attorney General acted outside the scope of his authority, under Executive Order 9835, in designating the committee as Communist. But such language must be considered in context and in close connection with the posture of the case, since it has reference only to the fact that the Attorney General chose to meet the complaint with a motion to dismiss, thereby necessitating, in the appellate proceedings, acceptance of the allegations in the complaint at face value.

The Executive order giving rise to the designation of subversive organizations contains the express requirement that such designation by the Attorney General shall be made after an "appropriate investigation and determination," which patently precludes arbitrary action in the listing procedure. Nevertheless, the Attorney General's election to proceed against the complaint with a motion to dismiss, while successful in the lower courts, placed him in the technical position of claiming authority under the Executive order to designate the refugee committee as subversive and Communist upon the very facts, clearly contradictory to such designation, alleged by the refugee committee in its complaint. In the view of Mr. Justice Burton this was overstraining the authority of the Executive since, he said, it amounted to an assertion of Presidential authority to designate an organization as Communist at the option of the Attorney General without reliance upon either disclosed or undisclosed facts supplying a reasonable basis for the determination. It follows naturally, therefore, that the mandate of the Court in fact strikes at omission in the procedural action within the judicial proceeding instituted by the refugee committee, rather than omission in the administrative action of the Attorney General as it applies to the refugee committee, upon undisclosed facts in his possession, pursuant to the Executive order.

Actually, the precise question involved does not appear to have been whether the President had the authority to authorize the Attorney General, acting in the capacity of an adviser to him, arbitrarily to list an organization as subversive. The question was whether the Attorney General could plead, as justification for an arbitrary designation, an Executive order requiring him to make such designation after "appropriate investigation and determination."

If Congress, by law, should require the Attorney General to file an annual or quarterly report listing all organizations which in his opinion, on the basis of facts available to him, are subversive, it is doubtful whether anyone would contend that an abuse of power was involved or that the Attorney General would have to resort to administrative hearings before including any organization in the list to be reported to Congress. It would seem that the Chief Executive should have as much right as Congress to require a report or other advice from his chief legal adviser.

SUBVERSIVE DESIGNATION SERVES ONLY TO IMPLEMENT LOYALTY PROGRAM

The directive in Executive Order 9835 giving rise to the Attorney General's designation of subversive organizations is subordinate to the main purpose of the order requiring loyalty investigations of Federal employees and only serves to implement that main purpose. Part V of the order sets up certain standards to be used for the refusal of employment or the removal from employment in an executive department or agency on grounds relating to loyalty. Section 1. f. of part V provides as follows:

"Membership in, affiliation with, or sympathetic association with any foreign or domestic organization, association, movement, group, or combination of persons, designated

by the Attorney General as totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or as having adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or as seeking to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means.

The President and the Attorney General have made it plain that membership or affiliation with an organization that is designated as subversive is simply one piece of evidence to be considered in determining the loyalty of a particular employee.⁸

Since Executive Order 9835 has paramount application to the individual employee it is a logical consequence that consideration of the employee dominantly affects consideration of an organization's contest of its rights following its designation as subversive by the Attorney General pursuant to Executive Order 9835. Significantly, on the same day that the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee case was decided, the Supreme Court decided a case involving an individual who had been denied Federal employment on the ground that she was a poor security risk, within the purview of Executive Order 9835. Additional perspective for consideration of the decision in the former case may be gained by reference to that individual's case.

Dorothy Bailey, the individual referred to, was a former Government employee who was in the process of being reemployed in a Federal agency when her application was denied after the agency's loyalty board determined that she was a poor security risk, largely upon the ground that she had been accused of membership in various subversive organizations. She denied these accusations in writing and under oath before the loyalty board. The Government's case was supported by unsworn testimony and Miss Bailey was afforded no opportunity to confront the witnesses against her. Upon appeal to the Loyalty Review Board the original ruling was affirmed, and she then brought a civil action in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for a declaratory judgment and an order directing her reinstatement, contending, *inter alia*, that her dismissal was unconstitutional. The district court found that the action taken by the loyalty board was constitutional. Miss Bailey then appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, where it was held (one judge dissenting) that the President has constitutional power, in the absence of congressional restriction, summarily to remove from Government service any person of whose loyalty he is not completely convinced.⁹ The Supreme Court granted certiorari, and

⁶ In a directive to the various loyalty boards, published on March 20, 1948, Seth W. Richardson, then Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board, said: "In connection with the designation of these organizations, the Attorney General has pointed out, as the President had done previously, that it is entirely possible that many persons belonging to such organizations may be loyal to the United States; that membership in, affiliation with, or sympathetic association with, any organization designated is simply one piece of evidence which may or may not be helpful in arriving at a conclusion as to the action which is to be taken in a particular case. 'Guilt by association' has never been one of the principles of our American jurisprudence. We must be satisfied that reasonable grounds exist for concluding that an individual is disloyal. That must be the guide." 13 Fed. Reg. 1471-3, 5 Code Fed. Regs., sec. 210.15, App. A (1949).

⁹ *Bailey v. Richardson*, 86 U. S. App. D. C. 248, 182 F. (2d) 46 (1950).

⁶ *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. Clark, Attorney General*, 85 U. S. App. D. C. 255, 177 F. (2d) 79 (1949).

⁷ *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee v. McGrath, Attorney General*, 339 U. S. 910 (1950).

on April 30, 1951, the Chief Justice announced a per curiam order¹⁰ affirming the judgment of the lower court by an equal division of the Court. (Mr. Justice Clark took no part in either of the cases under discussion by reason of his service as Attorney General when both cases arose.)

The action of the Supreme Court in the Bailey case leaves standing as the controlling summation of the law in that case a searching opinion written for the court of appeals by Judge E. Barrett Prettyman. In that opinion the basic issue is defined at the outset in this manner:

"The presentation of appellant's contentions is impressive. Each detail of the trial which she unquestionably did not get is depicted separately, in a mounting cumulation into analogies to the Dreyfus case and the Nazi judicial process. Thus, a picture of a simple black-and-white fact—that appellant did not get a trial in the judicial sense—is drawn in bold and appealing colors. But the question is not whether she had a trial. The question is whether she should have had one."

Therein lies the crux of the whole matter. The problem of loyalty and loyalty investigation is an extremely difficult one, and it is replete with side issues that tend to obscure the main issue, particularly because of our historic insistence upon due process of law for the protection of civil rights. But due process as a protective mechanism implies a deprivation, necessarily, and where there has been no deprivation of a civil right the assertion of the right to due process is obviously unfounded.

EXECUTIVE MAY DISCHARGE EMPLOYEES WITHOUT ASSIGNING REASONS

Furthermore, it is well established that the Constitution reposes power in the Executive to discharge employees from the executive departments or agencies without assigning reason, in the absence of statutes.¹¹ Even those employees whose tenure is governed by statute can be removed for cause and it can hardly be doubted that disloyalty would constitute sufficient cause for their removal.

The Government, just as any other employer, is under no obligation to hire as an employee anyone who does not come up to certain standards, provided that the same basic standard is applied equally to all individuals.

The due process clause in the Constitution is aimed at protecting a person against deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. However, it has been held repeatedly that "public offices are mere agencies or trusts, and not property as such", as stated in *Taylor and Marshall v. Beckham*, (178 U. S. 548, 577 (1900)). Therefore, if the relationship of a public officer to the public is inconsistent with a property right, and since it is obviously inconsistent with the right to life or liberty, as such, the due process clause does not apply to the removal of such officer from the public service.¹²

¹⁰ U. S. Law Week 3296 (April 30, 1951).
¹¹ *Myers v. United States* (272 U. S. 52 (1926)).

¹² Judge Prettyman examined this point in the Bailey opinion (supra, note 9) and continued in this manner: "Other considerations lead to the same conclusion. Never in our history has a Government administrative employee been entitled to a hearing of the quasi-judicial type upon his dismissal from Government service. That record of a hundred and sixty years of Government administration is the sort of history which speaks with great force. It is pertinent to repeat in this connection that the Lloyd-La Follette Act, sponsored and enacted by advocates of a merit classified Government service, expressly denies the right to such a hearing. Moreover, in the acute and sometimes bitter historic 100-year contest over

1912 STATUTE ASSUMES GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT IS NOT A "RIGHT"

The proposition that no one has an inherent or constitutional right to government employment, which is a privilege and not a matter of right, is embodied in the provisions of the Lloyd-La Follette Act.¹³ That act, which has been in uncontested effect since 1912, allows removal of a Government employee within the classified Civil Service "for such cause as will promote the efficiency of such service" and provides expressly that no examination of witnesses nor any trial or hearing shall be required except in the discretion of the officer directing the removal.

In 1946 it was held that the Civil Service Commission could summarily dismiss, or refuse employment to, an individual whose loyalty to the United States was subject to reasonable doubt. This use of the Lloyd-La Follette Act procedure was upheld by the court of appeals and the Supreme Court denied a petition for a writ of certiorari to review the case. *Friedman v. Schwellenbach*, 159 F. (2d) 22 (C. A. D. C.).

By means of Executive Order No. 9835 the President sought to establish certain standards and procedures for the exercise, in part, of his power to remove Government administrative employees for disloyalty or to preclude the employment of persons on that ground. In order to apply the loyalty investigation program to approximately 2,000,000 existing employees and to the applicants for Government employment who annually number about 500,000, the establishment of standards and the coordination of procedures are inevitably necessitated. The listing of subversive organizations by the Attorney General is an incident of the standards set up for checking the loyalty of the individual. The Supreme Court has ruled, albeit silently, that the procedure followed under Executive Order No. 9835 in refusing an individual Government employment on the grounds of disloyalty is not unconstitutional. At the same time the Supreme Court has ruled that an organization designated as subversive or Communist by the Attorney General, pursuant to Executive Order No. 9835, is entitled to have its day in court once that organization instigates a judicial contest of the factual basis for its designation. The Attorney General, having failed before the highest court on the contention that the organization presents no justiciable controversy, has yet a wide opportunity to enter that contest anew and therein establish the propriety of the designation.

The several concurring opinions of the majority of the Court in the Refugee Committee case extended the issue to include the due process question, as it applied to an organization on the Attorney General's list, even though the Court was simultaneously affirming a lower court's judgment that the safeguards of due process need not be observed in barring an individual from Government employment. Since the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations serves merely to implement the loyalty investigation of individuals, there is a prima facie indication that the Court is holding the right of the individual to be inferior to that of a designated group. It is true that in present circumstances the Court has granted judicial review for an organization on the Attorney General's list, while deny-

ing it to an individual whose discharge from Government employment was based in large part upon her affiliation with such an organization. Mr. Justice Jackson said this result seemed to him an inverted view of the law—it is justice turned bottomsides up. Whatever comment may be directed at this aspect of the result does not detract from the fact that it nevertheless supports the main purpose of the loyalty investigation program.

With reference to the listing, as such, of subversive organizations by the Attorney General in support of the loyalty investigation program, Mr. Justice Jackson also made this observation:

"I agree that mere designation as subversive deprives the organizations themselves of no legal right or immunity. By it they are not dissolved, subjected to any legal prosecution, punished, penalized, or prohibited from carrying on any of their activities. Their claim of injury is that they cannot attract audiences, enlist members, or obtain contributions as readily as before. These, however, are sanctions applied by public disapproval, not by law. . . . If the only effect of the loyalty order was that suffered by the organizations, I should think their right to relief very dubious."

Mr. Justice Jackson merely used this as a starting point, however, in his determination that the individual is the real target of the loyalty investigation procedure and that a hearing should be provided the organization in order that evidence as to its character may be presented to rebut the presumption of disloyalty against the Government employee who is a member of or affiliated with such organization. The dissenting minority of the Court, on the other hand, flatly stated that, "In our judgment organizations are not affected by these designations in such a manner as to permit a court's interference or to deny due process."

The views of the various members of the Supreme Court, as expressed in the several opinions rendered in the Refugee Committee case, are widely divergent. Despite the fact that the due process question has been widely explored in some of these opinions, it would be futile to attempt to forecast the Court's view of the Refugee Committee case should it again come before the high Court after the Attorney General joins the issue, as he now has an opportunity to do, in the district court. A fortiori, it is folly to suggest that the present ruling of the Court demands abrogating the procedures now followed in the loyalty investigation procedures. Certainly we must protect and preserve our democratic principles, but we must also exercise every reasonable means to protect our democracy; the infiltration of our Government by those persons adhering to subversive designs raises such a threat to our internal security that every proper effort must be continued to find and remove or preclude such persons from Government employment.

SOME ARGUE THAT THE LOYALTY LIST SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

WIDELY DIVERGENT VIEWS HAVE BEEN EXPRESSED WITH RESPECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS, IF ANY, OF THE SUPREME COURT DECISION HERE DISCUSSED AND THE COURSE OF ACTION WHICH THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD HEREAFTER PURSUE. SINCE THE VERY DAY ON WHICH THE SUPREME COURT DECISION WAS HANDED DOWN (AND PERHAPS FROM EVEN AN EARLIER DATE) THERE ARE THOSE WHO HAVE STRONGLY URGED THAT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL SHOULD WITHDRAW OR CANCEL ALL HIS PREVIOUS DESIGNATIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS AS SUBVERSIVE, IN WHATEVER CATEGORY, AND INSTITUTE SOME PROCESS OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS, POSSIBLY SUBJECT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW FOR THE FORMULATION OF ANY NEW DESIGNATIONS.

Some of these same persons, and perhaps others, have urged that the President should drastically amend his Executive order so as

the wholesale summary dismissal of Government employees, there seems never to have been a claim that, absent congressional limitation, the President was without constitutional power to dismiss without notice, hearing or evidence; except for the question as to officials appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate" (182 F. (2d) 46, 57).

¹³ 37 Stat. 555 (1912), as amended, 62 Stat. 354 (1948), 5 U. S. C., sec. 652 (1946, Supp. III).

to provide for elimination of the Attorney General's listing of organizations designated as "subversive," and to provide for individual administrative hearings in each loyalty case.

There have been some who have counseled that the entire loyalty program should forthwith be abandoned, on the ground that the Supreme Court decision has branded the loyalty program as at least un-American if not actually illegal.

Since the writer of this article has already responded to a semiofficial request, directed to him more or less "ex officio," for an expression of opinion with respect to this matter it is perhaps not inappropriate to append some comment here.

It is the writer's opinion that the Supreme Court has not "invalidated" the loyalty program, and will not "invalidate" it; and that instead of being either "illegal" or "un-American," the President's loyalty program represents a proper exercise by the Chief Executive of his powers, for the purpose of discharging his positive duty to protect the internal security of the United States.

Efforts to deter the Department of Justice from proceeding with trial of the pending case on its merits in the district court constitute the counsel of defeatism, entirely aside from the motive behind such efforts, which may well be one inimical to the best interests of the United States.

Editorial writers and columnists who allow themselves to be misled and in turn mislead others, perhaps in the rush of events and because they fail to comprehend fully the issues involved and the purport of the Court's decision, can plead unblushingly their own lack of comprehension as a defense. But for lawyers, in a similar case, there is no such easy excuse.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the Senator from Nevada is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] for his very thoughtful and kind remarks. These milestones, as they come along now, are not any too welcome, but as they pass it is good for our friends to notice the fact with gracious expressions.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to yield to the majority leader if I have time to do so.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from Nevada upon the anniversary of his seventy-fifth birthday.

He has been my good neighbor and friend for many years. Born on August 8, 1876, he had to work his way through high school and college. In spite of hardships he won many honors, was a star debater and athlete.

His long career of public service began when he was elected to the Nevada State Legislature at the age of 26. He had herded sheep and he knew the hardships faced by the workingman. In 1904 he introduced the first bill providing for an 8-hour day for the miners and smelter workers of Nevada. He studied law whenever he could and after his term in the legislature he was admitted to the bar. Following this, he was elected district attorney and later became chief justice of the Supreme Court

of the State of Nevada, when he was 36 years of age. As a Supreme Court judge, his decisions are still landmarks in the field of water and mining law. It is a significant fact that none of his decisions has been reversed by the Supreme Court of the United States.

Judge McCARRAN's decisions are important in other fields besides the field of water-right law. Some of his decisions were world-famous. Two such cases decided by Judge McCARRAN were the Kuhl case, involving identification by means of palm prints, and the Jim Butler West-End mining case, in which McCARRAN held that a ledge of ore which folded above the earth constituted just one ledge, and that Butler could follow it down both slopes instead of down only one slope of the fold. Judge McCARRAN's decision in the Kuhl case is used as a textbook by Scotland Yard and became the basis for decisions all over the world. The Butler case, world-famous at the time, was upheld by the Supreme Court, and forms one of the basic principles of mining law today.

During his practice of law he came to Arizona to try lawsuits, and was known as an able and outstanding attorney. A short time ago in an Arizona newspaper column entitled "Twenty Years Ago," I read an item about the distinguished Senator from Nevada coming to Prescott, Ariz., to try a lawsuit. As usual, he did a good job and won the case.

As the first native Nevadan elected to the United States Senate, he has been the author of many important pieces of legislation, including the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the McCarran Act, the Federal Airport Act, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Internal Security Act of 1950. He is now in his fourth term as a United States Senator and has consistently worked for the people of this country. In all that he has done from herding sheep to United States Senator he has won distinction for himself by serving others faithfully and well.

Mr. President, I had the honor of serving with the distinguished Senator from Nevada on the Committee on the Judiciary. I consider him an outstanding lawyer, an excellent judge, and an extremely able legislator.

I wish my friend, the senior Senator from Nevada many more happy birthday anniversaries.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I would suggest that the Senator from Nevada yield the floor, because I am afraid there will be a great many speeches on the subject of his birthday. I wish to be one, certainly, to join with other Senators who are making remarks on the subject and congratulating the Senator from Nevada on the seventy-fifth anniversary of his birth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada asked unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes. He had used approximately 1 minute of his time when he was interrupted. If he wishes to

conclude his remarks at this time he may do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate for 2 minutes on an entirely different subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada was given consent for that purpose. The Chair understands he reserves his time until later.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it was my good fortune, when I was elected to the Senate, to be assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary. It was there that I first met the distinguished Senator from Nevada. I was amazed at his industry. I am satisfied that the Senator from Nevada is one of our most tireless workers because of this industry and his ability. I came to know him very favorably indeed as a member of the Judiciary Committee. Since I have been assigned to the Committee on Rules and Administration I have not had the good fortune to be associated with him so closely as I had been formerly. But, having served with him in the Senate for a number of years and having great respect for him, I want to join my colleagues in extending congratulations to him today.

One of the things I should like to point out about his work is that, while he may not have been the first, I am certain he was among the first, to call to our attention the drifting foreign policy of the administration in Asia. Indeed all his colleagues will remember that in December of 1948 he urged that steps be taken to prevent Communist domination of China, and he presented to the Senate a carefully worked out plan for blocking Communist aggression in China at a minimum of expense to the United States and certainly at a minimum cost in American blood.

In February 1949, as I recall the date, he pleaded with the Senate to adopt his plan, or to take some similar action, to keep the iron curtain from going down over China, warning, in explicit words, that if the Communists took China, Korea would be next, and that in Korea we would have to fight, and fight under extremely adverse conditions.

Mr. President, his warnings went unheeded; but in the summer of 1950, after it was too late, a colleague of his took the floor and, in speaking about that warning, said that if the Senate had taken the advice of the Senator from Nevada, the war in Korea would have been avoided. Not a voice was raised in this Chamber to challenge the statement.

So, Mr. President, when we talk about the qualities of the man and his work, one of the phases of his work which I shall long remember was his effort to point out to the Senate and to the American people what would happen in China as a result of the drifting policy which we have pursued during the last number of years.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the Senate for not to exceed 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the

Senator from Washington is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, my personal friend, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] knows that I hold for him great affection and that I wish always for his health and happiness.

I can, I think, constructively commemorate his anniversary by making a brief reference to what the Senator from Nevada, PAT McCARRAN, has done for the section of the country in which I live.

Senator McCARRAN has been fighting all his life for expansion and development of the western regions of the United States. In 1944 he was responsible for creation of the Senate Special Committee To Investigate Industrial Centralization, of which he was made chairman. The committee wrote one of the most remarkable reports, to my mind, ever filed in the Senate—a report which became the blueprint for the expanding industrialization of the West, which is proceeding today at a more rapid pace than ever before in our history. It was Senator McCARRAN who formed the conference of western Senators, of which I am a member, and he has been repeatedly reelected year after year as chairman of that conference.

The conference of western Senators is a nonpartisan group of Senators representing 17 States whose members have banded together to form and guide legislation for the best interests of the West. The chairman of this group is elected annually by the members, and Senator McCARRAN has been unanimously elected and reelected ever since the group was formed.

The conference of western Senators meets at the call of its chairman to discuss and act upon matters of interest to the West or to individual Western States. By thus cooperating with each other, the members of this conference have been able to accomplish a great deal for the western empire and its component States which they severally represent.

Subcommittees of the conference of western Senators, appointed by the chairman, study pending legislation in different fields and report back to the conference as a whole. Individual members of the conference bring to the chairman the problems of their own States, as I have done many times; and when matters cannot be worked out by the chairman, speaking for the conference, then a meeting is called and the problem is laid before the whole conference for consideration and action.

Leading officials of the Government are called before the conference from time to time to discuss matters within their jurisdiction which affect the West.

The leadership of the senior Senator from Nevada, as chairman and spokesman, has been of inestimable and lasting value to the conference of western Senators. I am privileged to salute his efforts.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the Senate for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, it has been my privilege in recent years to know the Senator from Nevada probably in a somewhat different way than some other Senators have known him. In 1946, at the annual convention of the American Bar Association, it was my privilege to present to this distinguished American, Senator PAT McCARRAN, an award by the American Bar Association for distinguished service in the field of jurisprudence. The American bar and its members have ever been mindful of the outstanding work which had been done by the Senator from Nevada, in furtherance of the American system of jurisprudence. The American Bar Association felt that in the person of the Senator from Nevada it always had in the Senate a friend who clearly understood the practice and problems of the average American lawyer.

I may say today that the lawyers of America have always found the Senator from Nevada mindful of those problems and needs, and always ready to make a quick response to any demand made upon him.

At the time of the award which was presented to him at the Atlantic City convention of the American Bar Association in 1946, the members of that association were also mindful of the great work the Senator from Nevada had done in this body, representing lawyers and the law and our system of American jurisprudence. They were mindful that he was one of the small body of Senators, ten in number, who stood as one against the inroads which at one time were proposed to be made upon the traditional system of jurisprudence which meant so much to America and its people. As I recall, three of that group of ten still serve in the Senate today, namely, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who, with the Senator from Nevada, were three of the ten Senators who fought off the suggestion that the Supreme Court of the United States should be packed, as was then planned. The American bar honored him for that stand.

Then, somewhat later, along came the Administrative Procedure Act, in which the lawyers of America were interested because they knew that the rights and privileges of citizens should be protected better than then was being done. In the leadership of that fight stood Senator McCARRAN, and it was he who helped to put that measure upon the statute books of the United States of America, and who even today stands guard lest that act be demolished by those who do not like some of its applications.

Mr. President, in the present session of Congress we know of the great work the Senator from Nevada has done in connection with the Internal Security Act. I confidently believe that when the history of this period is written, that act will be recalled as one which meant much for the betterment of American life and for the protection of the institutions which we hold dear.

Also, Mr. President, I wish to comment for just a moment on the fairness of the

Senator from Nevada in the committee of which I am a member, and of which I have enjoyed being a member because of his chairmanship of the committee. I have yet to see him manifest any but an aspect of fairness in connection with the consideration of any measure before that committee, nor have I ever seen him attempt to insist upon his will over that of the other members of the committee. So I honor him for the great fairness he has shown to all members of the committee.

Then, Mr. President, I wish to say a word about the human side of the man, as I have come to know him, because he is one in whom I am intensely interested. Sometime ago I heard him talk about his interest in old Ireland because it was the native land of his mother and father. I heard him talk in most tender tones about his love and vision for that land. Because of that incident I learned to know even more about the human side of the Senator from Nevada.

All of us know that not only is he fair and just, but also he is positive in his views and actions, as a person in his position should be.

I join with the other Members of the Senate in paying the highest tribute of which I am capable in honoring the Senator from Nevada as a man and as a Senator whose ideals are of the highest known to this Nation.

Let me add, in his honor, that I hope he will have many, many long years yet in the Senate to give us the benefit of his integrity, his intelligence, his wisdom, and his utter and complete patriotism and loyalty to the United States of America.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak briefly in tribute to the Senator from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, many years before the junior Senator from New Jersey ever thought he would one day be a Member of the Senate of the United States, he had a profound respect for the moral courage, the integrity and the heroic patriotism of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

Little did the junior Senator from New Jersey think, in those days when he was campaigning in his own county in New Jersey for election to the New Jersey State Senate—in those now historic days when "Court packing" was a great issue before the country—that he would one day have the great privilege and honor to be a member of the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate under the able leadership of Senator McCARRAN.

Senator McCARRAN's battle against the world Communist conspiracy is not new. It goes back a long way before he attained chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee, and he has never confined it strictly to his own views. Never has he stopped his fight to write into every bill which affects national security provisions which will safeguard the welfare of the United States; and his has always been a winning fight.

Let us look back at the long, hard fight on displaced persons legislation. In fighting to have adequate security provisions written into the displaced persons law, Senator McCARRAN stood up against one of the most powerful lobbies which ever operated in this country. He was subjected to constant and bitter personal attack, and almost every form of vilification. His objectives and his motives were both deliberately misinterpreted. The pressure was terrific; but he stood his ground, and in the end he won his fight. The new displaced persons law, as enacted, was fair to the refugees, not discriminatory in any respect, and fully recognized this country's obligation to do its fair share for the unfortunate people who were torn from their homes by war circumstances over which they had no control; but, by virtue of the McCarran courage and persistence, the law contains provisions which are protecting this Nation today against the infiltration of Communists and other subversives under the guise of displaced persons.

Senator McCARRAN is the author of many important pieces of legislation, including the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the McCarran Act fixing the status of insurance as a business subject to State regulation, the Federal Airport Act, the Administrative Procedure Act, and the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Mr. President, it has been a privilege and a great inspiration for me to serve on the Judiciary Committee under the generalship of a man, a great American, who has never once since I was honored with membership on this time-honored committee, displayed to me a single interest which was not for the betterment and welfare of his country.

On this, the seventy-fifth anniversary of Senator McCARRAN's birth, I join with his colleagues and his host of friends throughout the Nation as they wish him Godspeed through his many remaining years of service to his country.

May each of those years be marked with the right to ever increasing tribute for his long, able, and distinguished service.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, I came upon the floor a moment ago from a session of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I was utterly unaware, as I entered the Chamber, that we were to mark or were marking the anniversary of the birth of our distinguished colleague, Senator McCARRAN. I think he has very successfully concealed both his birthday and his years. No one looking at him would imagine that he has attained the ripe age which it has just been said he has reached.

Mr. President, I have had the privilege of serving with Senator McCARRAN ever since I entered the Senate, on January 1, 1934. I shall never forget my service with him, upon the Committee on the Judiciary, during the very, very strenuous and exacting days when that committee had under consideration the bill to expand the Supreme Court. No member of that committee was more effective, more studious, more energetic, or more loyal than was the Senator from Nevada in the action which the Judi-

ciary Committee took upon that measure, which resulted finally in its defeat upon the floor of the Senate. It was an action participated in by the Senator from Nevada which, I am sure, will never be forgotten in the history of this Government.

It was a matter of great regret to me, personally, when, after the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed, changing the number of committees upon which a Senator could serve, it became necessary for me, as I saw my own personal duty, to retire from the Judiciary Committee. I regretted very much having to sever connections with that committee and with the distinguished Senator from Nevada, who is now its chairman. I am frank to say, however, that in recent days, as I have heard the call of the calendar and have noted the huge number of claims bills which are now referred to that committee, I have felt very regretful of the burden which the Senator from Nevada has to carry. But it is necessary only to look at him to know that he carries that burden well.

May I, in this altogether unintended and extemporaneous comment upon the distinguished service of my friend from Nevada, say that the West has never had a greater friend than the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]? Perhaps I may be permitted to say that, when I first heard of Senator McCARRAN, it was during the famous campaign of 1932. I was at that time an assistant to Mr. James A. Farley in the headquarters of the Democratic National Committee in New York City, conducting a presidential campaign. I was at that time the Democratic national committeeman from Wyoming. A gentleman by the name of Cornelius Vanderbilt had been making a survey of the entire United States, going from State to State, reporting to Mr. Farley upon the character of the campaign work which was being done throughout the United States. I shall always remember that, on the day when his report came in to me, the most eloquent spokesman on behalf of the Democratic ticket that year he found to be the Honorable PAT McCARRAN, of Nevada. I took a great deal of pride in that, because of the character of the name; and I am very happy to say that the Senator from Nevada has, in all my personal acquaintance with him, demonstrated that the comment was not at all out of order.

A man who has the courage of his convictions, Senator McCARRAN deserves the tributes of his colleagues upon the floor, and I am happy to have been able to participate on this occasion.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for one moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Maine is recognized for 1 minute.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in the tributes to Senator McCARRAN. It was a matter of great gratification and pride, recently, to have Senator McCARRAN, when appearing before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration to request funds for his committee, ask the Repub-

lican minority leader to place me on Senator McCARRAN's committee. His request was a testimonial to my opposition to Communism and to his faith and confidence in me; and I reciprocate his faith and confidence.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as one of the younger (?) Members of the Senate, I desire to say a word concerning the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. He has been a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee for a long, long time. There never was a more conscientious, right-thinking, upstanding, courageous, active member of that or of any other committee than has been PAT McCARRAN. For a long time he has been, and, I believe, still is, the head of the "watchdog committee" which has done so much good.

Through years of intimate association with him, I have found him to be earnestly a man who believes in the Constitution of the United States. He is a conscientious believer in Christianity. He believes in the things for which America stands. When he took the oath of office he held his hand toward Almighty God and said he would respect and forever defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic. He meant every word of it, and his every statement and his every act in life have shown how thoroughly he meant it. He is a great statesman, a great man, and a great friend, and it gives me the greatest pleasure to say a word concerning him on this occasion.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to join my colleagues in paying tribute to one of the greatest Americans I have ever met—PAT McCARRAN.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for recognition for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I learn on inquiry that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is not present, but I am confident that if he were present today he would certainly warmly share in all the gracious, fine, and richly deserved things that have been said concerning the senior Senator from Nevada. I have heard him so express himself on many occasions. I know the high regard and warm respect he entertains for his colleague from Nevada. So I felt that the RECORD should not be closed without having the statement placed on the RECORD.

As for myself, Mr. President, I desire to pay tribute not only to a colleague but to a man I esteemed as a friend before I ever became a Member of this body. I recall my first acquaintance with him. I always felt humble and like a pupil sitting at the feet of the master. Over the years my regard for him has ripened into a rich and enduring affection.

If I could find in the English language a single phrase so expressive that it characterizes what is in my heart with reference to PAT McCARRAN, I think it

would be the very simple phrase, "He is a good man." I recall reading in the Scripture that when the Great Teacher was taken away, a certain man claimed the body. The only description of him which we find in the Scriptures is that he was a good man. I can think of nothing that better expresses the affection and esteem that PAT McCARRAN's friends and associates have for him than to say that he is a good man, not only for this body, not only for his friends, but for the people of the United States of America. They will ever be in his debt.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed for 2 minutes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have been wondering what I could say in answer to or in recognition of the expressions which have been made today by my colleagues on the floor. All I can say is that if I have been worthy of those expressions, then, indeed, my life up to this time has been well spent.

Mr. President, I never meet a situation such as this but what I think of the hours through which my country is passing. I hope I may have the privilege of serving for years to come with those who serve with me in this body, because I think that my country is at the cross roads of its existence, and I believe the greatest service which an individual can render to his country at this time is to stand independently for the protection of the institutions which we so much admire and on which the world today so much depends.

Mr. President, I hope that the breath of life may be spared to me so that I may live to see my country again free from its internal and external enemies. Especially do I hope that we may see the United States freed from its internal enemies who are today boring from within to destroy man's last hope of individual human liberty.

I am not afraid of the external enemies, because I know the courage of my countrymen and I know the courage of our boys who will carry our banners abroad. But I am ever apprehensive of those who, in one guise or another, may gain such a position in this country as to weaken it and jeopardize the great place it so rightfully occupies in the history of the world.

I am grateful to those who have given me encouragement by their kindly words today. I am happy if I may have earned their expressions.

OCO THOMPSON

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, last Tuesday a quiet, unassuming man retired from active service as disbursing officer of the United States Senate. All the Senators know Oco Thompson. I am not sure that all of them know that he was such a good disbursing officer because he learned his work the hard way, and because, during part of his career, he was an assistant clerk of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate. I will admit that he learned a lot when he served from 1918 to 1920 as a clerk in the Finance

Division of the War Department, and no doubt his experience on the Senate Committee on Finance and on the Committee on Contingent Expenses contributed largely to his ability.

However, I am certain that when he started his career in the Senate Disbursing Office in 1924 it was the expert training he received from the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate that made him the fine disbursing officer he was.

It may be of interest that Oco Thompson was the fifth financial clerk in the history of the Senate. I note that the third was Richard B. Nixon. I am wondering if the illustrious Senator from California is related to this Nixon.

However, in the hearts and minds of those presently in the United States Senate, I am sure that Oco Thompson won a place of respect and honor during his long years of service.

I know all Senators join me in wishing him many years of health and contentment. We shall miss him and we are glad his brother will carry on, as we know he is well trained and highly able to continue the high standards set by the quiet man who left without any fanfare on Tuesday last—Oco Thompson.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3282) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate. The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 2, 1951, pp. 9536-9538.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not see the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on the floor. My understanding is that he would like to be present at the time the report comes before the Senate. Would there be any objection to withholding the consideration of the report temporarily until we can get the Senator from Michigan here?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I have talked to the administrative assistant to the Senator from Michigan, and he said he thought if we could hold up consideration of the report for a little while the Senator from Michigan would be here. Consideration of the report has been held up for quite a while.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am now advised that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] had an understanding

with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] that the Senator from West Virginia would make a statement with respect to certain provisions regarding personal-service limitations in the bill as not being a precedent in connection with other bills, and if that statement is to be made and that understanding is had there is no objection at this time.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator is absolutely correct; and at the appropriate time I intend to make such a statement.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I withdraw the reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the report.

At this time I wish to state that the main objection of the Senator from Michigan was to the fact that the conferees struck from the bill the so-called 10-percent personnel cut and in lieu thereof substituted specific cuts. The Senator from Michigan did not want that to be taken as a precedent. I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Michigan and for the benefit of the RECORD that the conferees discussed that matter at great length in the conference. We agreed that action on any one appropriation bill did not constitute a precedent as to action on others. For that reason I am free to say that that action on the part of the conferees was not intended to establish a precedent or lay down any pattern whatsoever. It was done simply in the interest of good operations in the particular departments involved in this bill, and the agencies connected with them.

Mr. President, I may say further that the amounts contained in the bill itself are below what the 10-percent cut would have brought them to. If we adopt the report, there is one amendment of the House which, at the appropriate time, I shall move that the Senate agree to. The conference report was adopted yesterday by the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. For what purpose?

Mr. CASE. For the purpose of making a brief statement on behalf of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in behalf of the senior Senator from Michigan, who sponsored several of the amendments which are subjects under consideration in this report, I should like the RECORD to show that the senior Senator from Michigan feels that the Treasury-Post Office bill offers a little different situation than other bills, and it was for that reason that he has consented or agreed to the waiving of the limitation on personal services which was adopted by the Senate in this and previous appropriation bills. But in doing so he wished it to be distinctly understood that

this is not to be considered as a precedent in future conferences nor as constituting a change in the attitude of the minority with respect to limitations on personal service funds. It is felt that the savings which have been referred to by the Senator from West Virginia are substantial, and that they do constitute a step in the direction of economy for which the members have been striving.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for about 2 minutes?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, may I ask what the Senator's purpose is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has a right to be heard in his own right.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then I ask, Mr. President, to be recognized in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I do not oppose the conference report. I simply suggest to the Senate that in the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill, of course, is contained the huge item for debt service, namely, the interest on the debt, which is gradually travelling in the direction of six thousand million dollars a year. It is a little difficult, I think, for our constituents to understand when we point out that each year we pay pretty close to \$6,000,000,000 for the privilege the Federal Government enjoys to borrow money from fiduciaries, insurance companies, banks, and individuals, giving them in return pieces of paper called bonds, and then, of course, having to liquidate the privilege money in the form of interest.

I propose today to introduce a bill for the establishment of a commission patterned somewhat on the Hoover Commission for an exploration of the national debt. I think it is one of the great problems of our time that have not been sufficiently explored, and I believe it merits serious consideration. It was only 40 years ago, Mr. President, that our debt was a little over a billion dollars, and today it is \$255,000,000,000. We can understand its magnitude in comparative terms when we say that amount is twice what all individuals and businesses and corporations in the United States owe today. So its impact upon the economy, its effect upon the future welfare of the country, upon the free destiny of a free system, Mr. President, is of high and transcendent importance.

In my opinion, there is a whole field of contingent commitments, implications, and guarantees along with the public debt that earnestly deserve the consideration of a body of experts. It is one of those peculiar things that necessarily lie in the field of expert and technical knowledge. I certainly do not profess to be one of the experts.

I remember that some time ago one of my colleagues in the House who was forever discoursing on the subject of money rose one day to make a long speech on the subject. He prefaced his remarks by saying that he understood that there were about 13 persons in the United States who understood the vagarious subject of money and finance,

but that he was not one of them. Therefore he undertook to discuss it.

I do not undertake to discuss that subject, except to allude to the existence of the problem and the necessity for assembling a body of expert talent to deal with it. The subject certainly has been underestimated in its impact upon the well-being and welfare of the country. So I use this occasion as a preface for what I propose to do later, in introducing a bill calling for the creation of a commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe that what the Senator is proposing is quite timely, because we do have an appropriation bill before us. His suggestion is not only well worth while, but it should have been carried out long ago. However, I hope that the Senator, in making suggestions for the activities of such a commission, may bring up a question which has always puzzled me.

When we talk about our huge debt, the question of governmental bookkeeping arises. We say that what comes in, subtracted from what goes out, makes the debt. We never list the capital assets of the Government. I am one who has always believed—and I strongly suspect that any such expert study would bear this out—that although we probably owe more than \$200,000,000,000, if someone were to sit down and conservatively estimate the capital assets of the United States Government, if we kept books as corporations keep books, we might well be in the black.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest to my friend from Washington that there are contingent liabilities and responsibilities under social-security, public-works projects, and many other things, which are difficult to evaluate on a dollar basis. But they are there, and they are going to continue for a long time. I think all of that should come within the purview of a study of this kind.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think it would be a good thing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill at this time, and I yield the floor.

There being no objection the bill (S. 1971) to establish a Commission on the Public Debt of the United States, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to speak on a subject which departs somewhat from the matter immediately before the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator mind having the conference report adopted first?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. The Senator from Colorado is recognized. There is no rule of germaneness in debate in the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understand that it is desired that I withhold my remarks until there has been action on the conference report. I am willing to do so. I assume that I shall be recognized afterward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3282, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
August 8, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 to the bill (H. R. 3232) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert "acquisition of the foregoing 300 passenger motor vehicles insofar as possible to be from automobiles seized in accordance with law, in lieu of purchase, and in addition, the Bureau of Internal Revenue may utilize not to exceed 20 passenger motor vehicles acquired through seizure as provided by law."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13.

Let me say in explanation to Members of the Senate that the form of the bill in both Houses provided for the number of vehicles. The House amendment merely requires that, so far as possible, the acquisition shall be from vehicles seized in accordance with law, rather than by the purchase of other vehicles. The provision is that only the minimum number be purchased new.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

The motion was agreed to.

A LETTER FROM A SOLDIER IN KOREA

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I shall take a few minutes to read into the RECORD a copy of a letter received by a Denver mother last March or April from her son in Korea. The letter reads as follows:

KOREA, March 10, 1951.

LEAR MOM: I was cold, wet, miserable, tired, hungry, and discouraged a few minutes ago, when I saw some sturdy soul come trudging up the mountainside with mail. Now, I am only cold, wet, tired, and hungry.

Your letter gave me a great lift in the midst of all this chaos and confusion. I now am well down in a foxhole on the top of the highest—I swear—mountain in all Korea, except for the one we were over yesterday, and the day before and the day before that.

We gallant cavaliers of the First Cavalry Division are trying to break the backs of the Chinese right now and, upon the reflection of the last week, I do not see how the bodies and minds of men keep going so long without losing their elements of control and composure.

I do not kick too much for myself, because all I must carry is weapon, ammunition, and rations—but these men of my platoon who must stagger up the slopes with 40 pounds

of machine gun ammunition—and the machine gun—and the rockets—only to be shouted at, shot at, and cajoled into running the last 50 yards through machine gun bullets, grenades, mortar fire—are men of the highest discipline.

And discipline for what? To be carried off the hill by four other men, and suffer smashed heads and broken bodies, thinking they are the unluckiest men in all the world until they see the dribble of others into the aid station with their heads smashed in a little deeper, and their bodies broken a little more? I do not know. It is hard to see the forest for the trees here.

And it is a question deeper than all questions when I look over that hill and watch the placid face of the Chinaman with the flap-eared can on his head and the quilted coat, and wonder what he is thinking, and—what is more important—why he is thinking it. In an hour or so I will be there where he is and he will be dead with a hole in his head much larger than you would expect from my little .30-caliber rifle.

That he will be dead I am very sure, because I have confidence in my men and in myself. Then I will sit down and, looking at his open glazed eyes (seeing much farther than mine I am very sure), and at his grimy hand clutching a grenade meant ultimately for me, I will call back to my company commander, and I will say, "We have taken the hill with only four casualties, and I count 15 dead Chinks."

And the most important part of the war (for me today at least) will be a number on a map and 15 less human beings on the earth.

As I have been writing here, six men (two from my own platoon) have passed my fox-hole, hit by mortar shrapnel. They are on their way down to the aid station—and rest—some for weeks and some for months.

Mortars—those are the fearsome things. They can get you anywhere—forward slope, rearward slope, in a deep hole or out. Since yesterday noon our company has lost 17 men from them. Off on the left there is a big fire fight going on now—deep-throated machine guns, rifles, and the crump of mortar—all going on at once. It will soon quiet down.

I wonder sometimes how much luck there is to the game, or is it luck? Back on the big hill we got pinned down close to a strong position and they grenaded us. I was lying in the open when they yelled "Grenade." I rolled over and felt something against my leg. Looked down just in time to see the handle of a potato-masher grenade against me. Blam. The handle of the thing gave me a real charleyhorse and a bum eye for a while. But not a puncture in me anywhere. The next man to me was killed by it. What is the answer?

Yesterday we were close in an area when I heard four deep "plops" go off over the hill. I knew they were 120-millimeter mortar—the biggest mortar they have and deadly up to 100 yards when they hit. We hugged the ground. The first one went well over us and went off with a tremendous blam behind us. I'll be—if all three of them didn't drop right in the middle of the platoon and they were duds. I looked up; 2 feet from me one of them was lying buried in the ground. (When they go off they dig a hole 6 feet across and take off a man's legs 20 feet away.) Luck? Prayer? I won't even hazard a guess. Something is making it possible to live.

And yet I would rather be here than anywhere in Korea now. It is life in its rawest form. It reduces sham to nothingness and here men are themselves. It cuts away all of the frou-frou of hypercivilization.

The real values of life are returned to us; the simple act of making a cup of coffee is a worth-while accomplishment.

As a leader of 40 men, I have the good feeling of responsibility, and, aside from the

close-in fighting, it is for me to provide many of their needs, minister to their hopes and fears, raise their morale, deal with their misbehavior, listen to their feelings as they express them, and try to direct their lives so that they will function with a will and a purpose.

There is no democracy on a hilltop, but, as a platoon leader, there is no other troop leading quite as intimate or as thorough, and it is a responsibility. There is no officer below to pass the buck to. What more could one ask in the way of service to those of lesser rank? The only guides I must religiously keep are: Decide with confidence; lead without fear; listen with compassion; and remain humble.

It is a far greater, more rewarding life on this hill than all the successes of what we call civilization. Mahatma Gandhi said once, and very accurately, about this business of leading, "There go my people; I must hurry and catch them for I am their leader."

And so it goes. Korea is tough, but what worth-while reward is gained without some price? Perhaps now you can see why I chose West Point. If not, someday I will explain.

Since I have discovered an important truth, I suffer much less—that is, that fear is only the emotion of ignorance. If I keep informed, fill the gaps of knowledge with educated guesses, fear disappears and I can do my job as coolly as though I were in Denver.

And that's all from Korea today.

Love,

DAVE.

The gentleman who wrote that letter is First Lt. David R. Hughes. He is a graduate of West Point, class of 1950, and has been decorated for valor.

THE KANSAS-MISSOURI FLOOD

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have spoken several times in the Senate about the havoc wrought by the angry waters of the Missouri and Kansas Rivers as they have overflowed their banks. The flood was at its worst where the Kansas joins the Missouri River at Kansas City. Kansas City has been my home and the home of my family for many years, and so I should like to speak briefly today of the indomitable courage with which the people of Kansas City have fought back. They have looked disaster in the face and said: You shall not have your way.

The toll from the Kansas-Missouri flood of mid-July has now been reckoned at nearly a billion dollars, not counting a \$2,000,000,000 value the Agriculture Department places on top soil washed from farm land. In Kansas City, Mo., four vital industrial areas were inundated over an area totaling 11 square miles. At least a score of lives were lost. Thousands were made homeless. Factories, utilities, rail yards were destroyed or damaged by flood, and seven square blocks of Kansas City were wasted by fire.

On Monday, July 16, 3 days after the worst flood disaster in United States history had struck Kansas City, the Missouri and Kansas Rivers went down almost as fast as they had risen, and just as fast the civic and business leaders of the city went to work to survey the results, to reconstruct the damaged area, to reckon how soon Kansas City could be back to normal again.

During that first week of recovery and despite its appalling losses and discour-

aging prospect, Kansas City's people began to speak of "the Kansas City spirit," a phrase that harked back to earlier days. The Kansas City Star editorialized: "You can't lick Kansas City." Although business and industry were faced with paying by far the major share of the damage, there was determination to pay it, to rebuild at any cost, to have faith in the future of the city, and to resume normal operations in record-breaking time.

Actually, Kansas City's commerce was never brought to the low point that many people imagined from press reports. Only 11 of the more than 130 square miles of the city were under water. Only four out of seven of the major industrial areas of the city were affected by the flood. No major bridges were lost, the airport was still dry, and 90 percent of the city's residential area was untouched by the waters. None of the main downtown districts suffered and few outlying retail districts were affected.

Far less is known over the Nation about the miraculous job of recovery that has been accomplished than was known about the flood itself. Just 3 weeks after the black Friday of July 13 when the flood struck, the courage and determination of Kansas City to rebuild and recover have borne near-miraculous results. The Kansas City stockyards, second largest in the world, opened on Monday, August 6, weeks ahead of schedule. Wheat resumed its flow into Kansas City on July 27 and receipts the first week-end totaled 1,300,000 bushels, highest mark of the year. Three of the major packing companies—Wilson, Swift, and Armour—have reopened their plants and begun shipments. The big plants of General Motors, Colgate-Palmolive-Peet, National and Sunshine Biscuits, and scores of others are either in limited or full operation.

More than 125 industrial companies hit by the flood have started operation again, and more than 30,000 workers are back on jobs that had been washed out. Railroads are back to 90 percent of full efficiency, airlines are flying at full peak, trucking is pulling its preflood load.

The remarkable Kansas City spirit is further evident in the faith backed by dollars that industry has tabbed for the future. The Santa Fe Railroad is going right ahead with a \$4,000,000 dollar diesel maintenance center in the flooded area. The Ford Motor Co. will proceed with its huge \$4,000,000 plant. Fairbanks, Morse & Co. will build a seven and one-half million dollar engine plant. By September 1 livestock receipts in this \$500,000,000-a-year meat center will be back to normal. Power lines, telephones and other utilities are being restored as fast as industry can make use of them. Temporary housing for some 3,000 families has been started and will be replaced by a permanent and model community housing plan.

The Kansas City spirit has been contagious. In the heart of the flood area, near-normal operations have been resumed by chemical companies, grain elevators, flour mills, farm-machinery concerns, transfer companies, sheet metal works, motor parts firms, tractor and

equipment companies, the car-assembly plant, paint manufacturers, milling companies, a creamery and dairy supply company, soap manufacturers, and lumber companies. Nine conventions are scheduled for Kansas City this month, and there has not been a single cancellation. Military contractors in the area lost a week or two of time, but they have never lost their will to carry on.

Kansas City still has a big job ahead. Some businesses, both large and small, may not be able to reopen for months because of the vast clean-up job and the necessity for replacing damaged machinery. Four million tons of silt and rubble have been carted away, but this is less than one-third of what the rivers dumped here. The Red Cross is still caring for more than a thousand persons in shelters, and thousands of others are still homeless, but are cared for by friends and relatives.

The progress to date has been astounding and revealing. As the people of Kansas City have labored to accomplish these results, they have said in their hearts that such a flood must never happen again. They know that Kansas City's future is assured only if a flood-control program is assured.

Mr. President, this has been a national disaster. The problem of preventing another flood is a national responsibility. Only the Congress, representing all the Nation, can give these people, as they work to bring order out of ruin, the comfort that comes from the assurance that it will not happen again. This assurance, I am confident, Congress will not deny them.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will proceed to call the measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning at the point at which the last call of the calendar was concluded.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 24, 1951, p. 8700.)

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 24, 1951, pp. 8700-8702.)

MRS. CORA B. JONES

The bill (H. R. 3495) for the relief of Mrs. Cora B. Jones was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF GIRL SCOUTS IN THE USE OF EMBLEMS, BADGES, AND SO FORTH

The bill (H. R. 3442) to protect the Girl Scouts of the United States of America in the use of emblems and

badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases heretofore adopted and to clarify existing law relating thereto, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of this measure is to protect the Girl Scouts of America in their use of emblems and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases now or heretofore used by the organization in carrying out its program. This protection has heretofore been given the Girl Scouts through the medium of a design patent renewable every 14 years.

The design patent last issued to the Girl Scouts is due to expire this year; and the committee felt that rather than require the Girl Scouts to periodically seek a renewal to the design patent, it would be better to afford them the same protection by an amendment to their basis charter. A bill granting similar protection to the American Legion was passed by the Senate earlier in this Congress.

In view of the need of the Girl Scouts of America for the protection afforded by this proposed legislation and in view of the action of the Senate in granting similar protection to the American Legion, the committee recommends that this bill be favorably considered.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator, and I withdraw objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3442) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DR. ANTHONY M. OPISSO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 775) for the relief of Dr. Anthony M. Opisso which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Anthony M. Opisso shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD J. WALLING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 495) for the relief of Richard J. Walling which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the figure "\$1,000," to strike out "in full

satisfaction of his claim against the United States for wages lost and debts incurred as a result of his erroneous confinement by the United States Army from April 14, 1948, to August 13, 1948, though he was not a member of the Army nor subject to its jurisdiction:" and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages sustained by him as the result of his wrongful arrest by a member of the United States Army on April 14, 1948, and his confinement by the Army from that date to August 13, 1948:", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard J. Walling, of Jerome, Idaho, the sum of \$1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages sustained by him as the result of his wrongful arrest by a member of the United States Army on April 14, 1948, and his confinement by the Army from that date to August 13, 1948: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AKIKO MITSUHATA

The bill (S. 263) for the relief of Akiko Mitsu-hata was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Akiko Mitsu-hata, Yokohama, Japan, the Japanese fiancée of Douglas Dean Whitney, a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Akiko Mitsu-hata shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided,* That the administrative authorities find that the said Akiko Mitsu-hata is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Douglas Whitney, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Akiko Mitsu-hata, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Akiko Mitsu-hata, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of said Akiko Mitsu-hata as of the date of payment by her of the required visa fee and head taxes.

SECTION 32 OF THE AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT OF 1917—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 172) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of

1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill, please?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill would amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act so as to permit the return of vested property formerly owned by citizens or nationals of Germany or Austria who acquired that property by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance from American citizens. It would provide that the former owner of such property be eligible for its return, notwithstanding technical "enemy" status, if such owner shows by reliable, probative, and substantial evidence that he never was a member of the Nazi Party. This in substance is the same bill as the one the committee reported favorably in the last Congress, and upon which the Senate acted favorably. No action, however, was taken by the House of Representatives.

It was the belief of the committee in the Eighty-first Congress, and it is likewise the belief of the committee in this Congress, that the property here seized was basically and inherently American property; and, while the committee feels that the seizure of this property might have been justified during the war, the retention of it is no longer justified in the light of present-day conditions. The committee therefore recommends that the President be given the discretion to return this property.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

D. LANE POWERS AND ELAINE POWERS TAYLOR

The bill (S. 665) for the relief of D. Lane Powers and Elaine Powers Taylor was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$552 to D. Lane Powers, of Trenton, N. J., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained by him as a result of a collision between his automobile and an Army vehicle parked at night without lights on State Highway No. 33 in East Windsor Township, Mercer County, N. J., on June 10, 1945, and to Elaine Powers Taylor, of Trenton, N. J., the sum of \$2,117, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, pain, and suffering, and disfigurement sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred, as a result of said accident: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this

act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

PURCHASE OF AUTOMOBILES FOR CERTAIN DISABLED VETERANS

The bill (S. 1864) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans who served during World War II, and persons who served in the military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall be very glad to explain it. The purpose of the bill is simply and solely to insure that veterans who are amputees as a result of World War II, who, for reasons beyond their control, have not yet had opportunity to avail themselves of the special rehabilitation benefits of Public Law 798, Eighty-first Congress, should retain that opportunity, and that amputee veterans of the present conflict should have precisely the same benefits as have been available to World War II veterans.

The rehabilitation benefits to which I refer are, of course, the contributions for the purchase of special automobiles so that these amputees, who are all leg amputees, will have a means of locomotion to help them overcome the tragic loss they have suffered.

The bill provides, as did Public Law 798 and its predecessors, that these benefits shall be available only to those who have suffered the loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs at or above the ankle, due to disability incurred in or aggravated by their period of service.

The bill provides, as did the previous laws on the subject, that the Veterans' Administration is authorized to pay \$1,600 for the purchase, or toward the purchase, of an automobile, provided the veteran in question is licensed to operate such an automobile. The veteran must make the application for this benefit within 3 years after enactment of the bill, or within 3 years after the date of the veteran's discharge, if the discharge occurs after enactment.

This rehabilitation benefit program was first enacted in 1946, and was continued in 1947, and again in 1948 and 1949. It expired on June 30, 1951. This left some 200 amputee veterans of World War II who are still in the hospital, and hence have not been discharged from the service, ineligible for the benefit.

Of course, there was no provision in the old law or in any law now on the statute books for comparable benefits for amputee veterans of the present Korean conflict and present emergency period.

The pending bill, which was sponsored by all the members of the subcommittee who have studied this matter, and by the distinguished chairman of the committee on Labor and Public Welfare and was unanimously confirmed by the full committee, merely continues for an additional 3 years the benefits previously available for World War II veterans, so as to give those World War II veterans who have not yet been discharged from the service an opportunity to get these benefits. This bill would also provide the same benefits for Korean veterans and other veterans of the present emergency.

A bill providing broader benefits was enacted during the Eighty-first Congress, but it was vetoed by the President. I hope that the Senate and the House will pass the pending bill so that these benefits can be promptly extended to all those who are eligible.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey wishes to thank the Senator from New York. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I propose a technical amendment to the bill. It is simply to correct a typographical error, on page 2, lines 3 and 4, by changing the word "thereunder" to "thereafter."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed, under such regulations as he shall prescribe, to provide or assist in providing an automobile or other conveyance by paying not to exceed \$1,600 on the purchase price, including equipment with such special attachments and devices as the Administrator may deem necessary, for each veteran of World War II, and each person who served in the active military, naval, or air service of the United States on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall thereafter be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress, who is entitled under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to compensation for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs at or above the ankle due to disability incurred in or aggravated by either of such period of service: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made under this act for the repair, maintenance, or replacement of any such automobile or other conveyance and no veteran shall be given an automobile or other conveyance until it is established to the satisfaction of the Administrator that such veteran will be able to operate such automobile or other conveyance in a manner consistent with his own safety and the safety of others and will be licensed to operate such automobile or other conveyance by the State of his residence or other proper licensing authority: *Provided further*, That the furnishing of such automobile or other conveyance, or the assisting therein, shall be accomplished by the Administrator paying the total purchase price, if not in excess of \$1,600, or the amount of \$1,600, if the total purchase price is in ex-

cess of \$1,600, to the seller from whom the veteran is purchasing under sales agreement between the seller and the veteran: *And provided further*, That no veteran shall be entitled to receive more than one automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this act and no veteran who has received or is entitled to receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of the paragraph under the heading "Veterans' Administration" in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947, as extended, or the act entitled "An act to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes", approved September 21, 1950 (Public Law 798, Eighty-first Congress), shall be entitled to receive an automobile or other conveyance under the provisions of this act.

Sec. 2. The benefits provided in this act shall not be available to any veteran who has not made application for such benefits to the Administrator within 3 years after the effective date of this act, or within 3 years after the date of the veteran's discharge or release from active service if the veteran is not discharged or released until on or after said effective date.

Sec. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Veterans' Administration, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry into effect the provisions of this act.

PROVISION FOR MORE EFFECTIVE EVALUATION OF THE FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF THE EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object, I may say I have no objection to the request, except that I expect to be engaged in a meeting of the Appropriations Committee this afternoon. It is an important meeting. I cannot, of course, very well be in two places at the same time.

Mr. President, perhaps the Senator has in mind that the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate unanimously requested that this bill be referred to it for further consideration. I have no objection to the bill's being referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, but I do not want it referred there for an unlimited time. If we may have an agreement on some time within which the committee will act on it and will report the bill again, so that it will get back on the calendar, I will, myself, make the unanimous-consent request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; but I do not want it referred there indefinitely, to be pigeonholed.

Mr. CASE. I may say to the distinguished Senator that the junior Sena-

tor from South Dakota has no authority to speak in behalf of the Committee on Rules and Administration, of course; but the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is a member of the committee, suggested that that was not the desire of the committee. I see the Senator from Arizona is present, who, I understood, was going to make the request which the Senator has suggested. If that can be agreed to, I think it would meet the situation.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that the discussion relates to Senate bill 913?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am referring to Senate bill 913, yes. I made the statement, I may say, before the able chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration entered the Chamber, that I have no objection to referring the bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration, but would be very happy to have it referred there, and would make the unanimous-consent request, myself. I do not think unanimous consent would be required, but I should be glad to make the unanimous-consent request, since the bill has been announced as next in order, that it be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration, provided there is some limited time within which the committee is to report, either favorably or unfavorably. I do not want it sent to the committee if it is to be buried with no further action being taken on it at this session of the Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. The merit of referring the bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration is that it is similar, in a number of respects, to a bill on this same subject which was introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Under the circumstances, the Senator from Nebraska deemed it proper the bill should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, in order that the bill which he had drafted and introduced might be compared with the bill reported by the committee of which the Senator from Arkansas is the chairman.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I inquire how long the bill introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] has been before the Committee on Rules and Administration?

Mr. HAYDEN. It has been some time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to the able Senator from Arizona that the bill now being discussed was introduced last year as Senate bill 2898, as I remember the number. The committee considered it. It was reintroduced this year, in February, and was before the committee for more than 5 months before being reported. It has now been reported. We have been somewhat diligent in at least reporting the bill, after a very deliberate, careful, and thorough study of it.

Simply because some other Senator has a bill pending before another committee, and desires to have this bill referred to that committee for an indefinite period of time, I submit it is hardly fair to the committee which has re-

ported this bill to comply with the request. If a time could be set when the bill would be reported either favorably or unfavorably, my position would be different.

Mr. HAYDEN. I cannot at this moment state how long the bill will be under consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration, for the simple reason that, at the moment, all members of that committee are in fact very busily occupied with duties on other major committees of which they are members. I know that is true in my own case, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. It is also true of the Senator from Nebraska and of other Senators who are members of very active committees.

Of course the question could be raised whether, under the Legislative Reorganization Act, which in effect provides a series of rules for the organization and jurisdiction of committees of the Senate, the subject matter is not primarily a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration. That is, some question could be raised as to whether the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments had original jurisdiction of this matter, and whether the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Arkansas should ever have been sent to his committee. That is a question of jurisdiction which might properly be raised, if necessary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was not raised with reference to the bill which was introduced last year and which remained before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments last year, it was not raised when the measure was referred this year, and it has not been raised in the 5 months' time in which the committee considered the bill. I think a Senator has a perfect right to raise it at any time.

Mr. CASE. May I ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration what committee of the Senate had jurisdiction of the original reorganization bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was a special joint committee of which Senator La Follette was chairman for the Senate and Representative MONRONEY, at that time, was chairman for the House of Representatives.

Mr. CASE. If the Senator will yield for a further question, a direct proposal to amend the rules of the Senate relating to the duties of committees would normally be referred to what committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. To the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CASE. Does not this bill relate to the responsibilities and duties of members of certain committees of the Senate?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The purpose of the bill is to create a joint committee on the budget. The membership of the joint committee would be determined by membership of Senators on existing committees.

Mr. HAYDEN. Both the McClellan bill and the Wherry bill contain provisions of that kind.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The purpose in bringing the matter up is that if it relates to the responsibilities of committee members it would seem not inappropriate that the request that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration should be made.

Mr. HAYDEN. No question was raised when the Senator from Nebraska introduced his bill and it was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is no question raised with respect to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, unless an agreement can be had for its reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I shall be obliged to object.

Mr. HAYDEN. A motion was agreed to at a meeting of the Committee on Rules and Administration held on last Friday that the chairman of the committee, and I am acting in that capacity at this time, be requested to secure a referral of Senate bill 913 to the Committee on Rules and Administration. If it can be done by unanimous consent, very well. If not, in due time I shall make a motion to that effect.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to observe that, on the basis of what I would regard as simple fairness, which would require the Committee on Rules and Administration to report the bill, since the Committee on Expenditures has never requested to have the bill referred to it after another committee has done work on it, I am perfectly willing that it go to the Committee on Rules and Administration for a reasonable time, but I do not want to have it pigeonholed during the remainder of the session. I am not trying to suggest any particular time for a report, but certainly some period can be indicated as a reasonable time within which the committee shall report the bill to the Senate, and we shall have to fight it out on the basis of the rules.

Mr. HAYDEN. If I could give the Senator such assurance, I should be glad to do so but that cannot now be done.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I suggest that the able chairman confer with the members of the committee. I am perfectly willing to have the bill go to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, in order that an opportunity may be given for a little consultation, I renew my suggestion that the bill be placed at the foot of the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is apparent that this bill cannot be disposed of today. To place it at the foot of the calendar would only take more time. I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ERADICATION AND CONTROL OF POISONOUS WEEDS ON RANGE AND PASTURE LANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1041) to provide for the eradication and control of poisonous weeds,

especially Halogeton glomeratus, on range and pasture lands in the several States and Territories, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this matter was first taken up by the conference of western Senators, at which time representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior addressed the conference. It was at that time stated that no legislation was necessary, that all that was necessary was an appropriation. The money has already been arranged for by budget estimates coming along regularly in connection with an appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, and it would also come under the appropriation for the Agricultural Department. However, in view of the fact that the bill was introduced by the junior Senator from Nevada notwithstanding the fact that legislation is already on the statute books authorizing the departments to carry out this work, I hope we may consider the bill favorably today, and enhance the possibility of a study being made in order that the eradication of the deadly weed specified in the bill may be brought about.

In that respect, Mr. President, let me say that the West has been very much concerned with this new danger which has arisen on the open public domain, both in the forests and on Taylor Grazing Act lands, and which is so destructive of animal life. It is something with which we have been unable successfully to cope. It came into existence almost overnight, and it spreads with great rapidity. It is almost impossible to deal with it successfully, but the sooner we try to control it, the better.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I might say that those of us who are on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have been going into the question very carefully, and we agree absolutely with the views expressed by the Senator from Nevada. It is a most important measure to get underway in order to eradicate an evil which is causing so much havoc and ruin among the livestock interests.

Mr. McCARRAN. Those who are interested in the subject have seen to it that appropriation items for carrying out the work are included in the appropriation bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The amendment was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "Halogeton Glomeratus Control Act."

SEC. 2. In order to protect the livestock industry from losses caused by the poisonous weed Halogeton glomeratus now or hereafter existing on lands in the several States, to provide for the maintenance and development of valuable forage plants on range and pasture lands, and to prevent destruction or impairment of range and pasture lands and other lands by the growth, spread, and development of the poisonous weed known as Halogeton glomeratus, it shall be the policy of the Federal Government, acting independ-

ently or in cooperation with the several States and political subdivisions thereof, private associations and organizations, and individuals, to control, suppress, and eradicate this weed, poisonous to livestock, on lands in the several States irrespective of ownership.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior with respect to lands under his jurisdiction, including trust or restricted Indian lands, and the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to any other lands, either independently or in cooperation with any State or political subdivision thereof, private association or organization, or individual, are severally authorized, upon such conditions as they respectively deem necessary—

(1) to conduct surveys to detect the presence and effect of Halogeton glomeratus on lands in such State;

(2) to determine those measures and operations which are necessary to control, suppress, and eradicate such weed; and

(3) to plan, organize, direct, and carry out such measures and operations as either of them may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) Measures and operations to control, suppress, or eradicate Halogeton glomeratus on lands under the jurisdiction of any department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation of the Federal Government shall not be conducted without the consent of the department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation concerned.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture in his discretion may allocate, out of any sums appropriated to him under authority of this act, to any department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation of the Federal Government having jurisdiction over any land on which there exists Halogeton glomeratus, such amounts as he deems necessary for the control, suppression, and eradication of such weed by such department, agency, independent establishment, or corporation, as the case may be. Sums appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior under authority of this act shall be expended for work on, or of benefit to, lands under his jurisdiction, including trust or restricted Indian lands. Either Secretary may also accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services of Federal, State, and local officers and employees as are available.

SEC. 5. In the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, as the case may be, no expenditure shall be made from funds appropriated under this act to control, suppress, or eradicate Halogeton glomeratus on lands in the several States until there have been made or agreed upon such contributions, in the form of funds, materials, services, or otherwise, by the States and political subdivisions thereof, private associations, and organizations, and individuals, toward the work of controlling, suppressing, or eradicating such weed, as the Secretary of Agriculture or the Secretary of the Interior, respectively, may require.

SEC. 6. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Agriculture and to the Secretary of the Interior such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(b) Any sums so appropriated shall be available for expenditure for the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for the purchase, hire, maintenance, operation, and exchange of aircraft and passenger-carrying vehicles, and for such other expenses as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

(c) Such sums shall not be used to pay the cost or value of any property injured or destroyed in carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. The authority contained in this act shall be in addition to, and shall not limit

or supersede, authority contained in existing law with respect to the control, suppression, and eradication of pests, plants, and plant diseases.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the eradication and control of *Halogeton glomeratus* on lands in the United States, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3463) to authorize the transfer of certain naval vessels was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey by whom the request was made?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The request was made by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. WHERRY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I do not feel that it is good legislative procedure for some Senator, who is absent from the floor but who is in the capitol building, to request that a bill be objected to.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It may not be good legislative procedure, but it is a precedent which has been followed ever since I have been a Member of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been passed over.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, another Senator lodged with me a request that the bill be passed over.

Mr. HUNT. I have no objection to a request that the bill go over, but I should like to know the reasons therefor.

Mr. CASE. I was not advised of the reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been passed over on objection, and the clerk will report the next order.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO ST. AUGUSTINE PORT, WATERWAY, AND BEACH COMMISSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1214) to authorize and direct conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Florida to the St. Augustine Port, Waterway, and Beach Commission, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "deed", to insert "without monetary consideration"; and in line 6, after the word "Beach", to strike out "Commission of the St. Augustine Port, Waterway, and Beach", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the General Services Administrator is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed without monetary consideration to the St. Augustine Port, Waterway, and Beach District, in St. Johns County, Fla., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following-described tract of land, together with all improvements thereon, in St. Johns County, Fla.: A strip of land situate, lying

and being partly in section 8, township 7 south, range 30 east, and partly in section 9, township 7 south, range 30 east, and being a part of or lying immediately adjacent to the plat of "Vilano Beach," unit A, as recorded in map book 4, at page 47, records of St. Johns County, Fla., and more particularly bounded and described as follows: Beginning in the southward line of Mario Road, at the intersection of the eastward line of Anahma Drive, produced; thence eastwardly and southeastwardly 1,238 9/10 feet along said southward line of Mario Road and binding on the several curves thereof, to the westward line of Zamora Street produced; thence south 80 degrees 4 minutes west 472 feet; thence northwestwardly and westwardly 649 8/10 feet on a curve, or curves, concentric with the curve or curves of the southward line of Mario Road and distant therefrom 333 feet, measured normally to said curve or curves; thence south 80 degrees 4 minutes west 250 feet, more or less, to the Tolomato or North River; thence northwardly 333 feet, more or less, along said Tolomato or North River; thence north 80 degrees 4 minutes east 250 feet to the place of beginning.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER TO THE AIR FORCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN MISSISSIPPI

The bill (S. 1673) to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Air Force certain property in the State of Mississippi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to transfer, without reimbursement, to the Department of the Air Force the following-described lands in Harrison County, Miss.:

(a) That certain tract of land comprising one hundred and forty-seven acres, more or less, lying within sections 19 and 30, township 7 south, range 9 west, at Keesler Field, Miss., now occupied by the Department of the Air Force under a permit from the Veterans' Administration; and

(b) That certain tract of land lying northwesterly of and abutting the land described in (a) above, comprising fourteen and thirty-five one-hundredths acres, more or less, within sections 19 and 30, township 7 south, range 9 west, said land being approximately described as follows:

Beginning at the section corner common to sections 25, 30, 31, and 36, township 7 south, ranges 9 and 10 west, Saint Stephens base and meridian; thence north no degrees thirteen minutes west, one thousand two hundred eighty-five and ten one-hundredths feet to a point on the west line of section 30, township 7 south, range 9 west; thence south eighty-seven degrees fourteen minutes east, two hundred twelve and twenty one-hundredths feet to a point at the intersection of the south line of Pass Christian Road and the east line of Peters Lane; thence north one degree eighteen minutes west, one thousand three hundred seventy-four and twenty one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of Peters Lane; thence continuing along the east line of Peters Lane north one degree three minutes west, one thousand six hundred sixteen and eighty one-hundredths feet to the true point of beginning; thence leaving the east line of Peters Lane north forty-five degrees eighteen minutes east, one thousand one hundred sixty-three and forty one-hundredths feet to a point on the south shore line of the Back Bay of Biloxi; thence following the south

shore line of said bay in a northwesterly direction one thousand one hundred feet, more or less, to its intersection with the easterly line of Peters Lane extended; thence south one degree three minutes east, one thousand four hundred and sixty feet, more or less, along the east line of Peters Lane extended to the true point of beginning;

both tracts being as shown in color on map designated as "Keesler Field, Miss., DRNG. 727," dated May 28, 1944, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

SALE OF CHICAGO APPRAISERS' STORES BUILDING TO THE CITY OF CHICAGO

The bill (H. R. 3049) to authorize the sale of the Chicago Appraisers' Stores Building to the city of Chicago was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRAVEL BY DEPENDENTS OF MISSING PERSONS, ETC.

The bill (H. R. 1199) to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation of the bill is requested.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, are we considering Calendar No. 550, Senate bill 1199?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HUNT. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that the bill provides first for the transportation of dependents of those of our armed services who are missing in action, where the family is abroad. It provides for the transportation of the family home. Then it provides one further thing, which is an amendment to the House bill. The law now provides that in the event the soldier has an automobile it and other personal property shall be transported back to the United States. But there is no provision for taking any household goods or the automobile from the port where they arrive to the home of the missing or deceased soldier. The bill simply provides for that service.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. That is the phase of it that this proposed legislation also covers and attempts to provide for?

Mr. HUNT. Yes.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1199) to amend section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended, relating to travel by dependents and transportation of household and personal effects, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "dead", to insert "injured"; in line 8, after the word "missing", to insert "for a period of 30 days or more"; on page 2, line 13, after the word "completed", to insert "When the person is in an 'injured' status, the movement of dependents or household and personal effects

provided for herein may be authorized only in cases where the anticipated period of hospitalization or treatment will be of prolonged duration. No transportation shall be authorized pursuant to this section unless a reasonable relationship exists between the condition and circumstances of the dependents and the destination to which transportation is requested. Beginning June 25, 1950, and for the purposes of this section only, the terms 'household and personal effects' and 'household effects' may include, in addition to other authorized weight allowances, not to exceed one privately owned motor vehicle, shipment of which at Government expense is authorized in those cases where the vehicle is located outside the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska"; on page 3, line 20, after the word "act," to insert "heretofore not allowed by virtue of inability to establish death or injury as a result of military or naval operations"; and after line 22, to insert "(c) Payments made by disbursing officers on or after June 25, 1950, and prior to the date of approval of this act for the transportation, packing, and unpacking of privately owned motor vehicles transported under the conditions set forth in section 12 of the Missing Persons Act, as amended by section 1 of this act, are hereby ratified."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PER CAPITA PAYMENT TO MEMBERS OF THE MENOMINEE TRIBE OF INDIANS

The bill (H. R. 3782) to authorize a per capita payment to members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is called for.

Mr. McCARRAN. If an explanation is not forthcoming, I must ask that the bill go over. I do not like to do that, but I see no other way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Nevada that it is my understanding that the Menominee Tribe has on deposit in the Treasury a sum in excess of \$2,000,000, which is largely the result of their logging operations. As I think the Senator knows, the Menominee Indians have carried on logging operations for a number of years, and are more or less independent by reason thereof. The committee amendment proposes to reduce the interest feature from 5 to 4 percent, which is to the advantage of the Government.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, what I should like to know is whether precaution is taken by the provisions of the bill against exorbitant attorneys' fees? Is the question of attorneys' fees dealt with in the bill? We had that

matter under consideration on the floor the other day with reference to the distribution of money from the Treasury to certain tribes of Indians.

Mr. CASE. The bill itself contains no language on the subject, but it may be covered by general legislation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may go to the foot of the calendar. By the time we reach it at the foot of the calendar, perhaps the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 551, House bill 3782, which I asked to have go to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have been advised that there are no attorneys' fees involved, and therefore I withdraw my objection, and ask for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3782) to authorize a per capita payment to members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, in line 4, after the name "Menominee", to strike out "4" and insert "5."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill (S. 1786) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions and catastrophes of nature, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each of the following officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States the sum designated in full satisfaction of such officer's or employee's claim against the United States for compensation for reasonable and necessary personal property lost while in the course of his duties as a result of war conditions or catastrophes of nature:

George Alexander Armstrong, \$1,100; Robert M. Berry, \$333; Virginia M. Brown, \$1,235.65; Leo J. Callanan, \$883; O. Edmund Clubb, \$2,160; John H. Correll, \$400; Sabin J. Dalferes, \$788; Owen L. Dawson, \$1,977; Paul M. Dutko, \$3,817.50; Alice Draper, \$1,200; James E. Henderson, \$1,380; Peter Hooper, Jr., \$259.45; Rolf J. Huse, \$1,453; Louis L. Kirley, \$996.61; Olive E. Knowlson, \$313.50; Margaret L. Mackiernan, \$2,530.75;

Roberta L. Meyerkort, \$831.13; Robert D. Murphy, \$1,551; Owen J. C. Norem, \$1,623; Norma Voelker Odom, \$826; Eleanor M. Shields, \$423; Carl D. Soresi, \$792.80; Wells Stabler, \$198.72; Angus Ward, \$1,897.49; Gerald Warner, \$1,928.21; and Eugene Zawadzki, \$297.

CREATION OR CHARTERING OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS BY ACT OF CONGRESS

The bill (S. 1898) to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby declares and establishes this policy with respect to the creation or chartering, by act of Congress, of corporations other than corporations wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof:

(a) The benefits and prestige of a charter awarded by act of Congress or not hereafter to be conferred upon or made available to any such corporation other than a corporation not for profit, no part of the income or assets of which inures to the benefit of any of its members, directors, or officers, or is distributable thereto otherwise than upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation; nor to any such corporation organized, operated, or intended to be operated for other than charitable, educational, patriotic, or civic-improvement purposes, or societies for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals.

(b) No such corporation is hereafter to be created or chartered by special act of Congress except after careful investigation by the Department of Justice of the corporation proposed to be created or chartered, its purposes, its incorporators or proposed incorporators, and all other pertinent facts relative thereto. No such corporation hereafter created or chartered by act of Congress shall perform or carry out or attempt to perform or carry out any purpose not specifically set forth in its charter.

(c) Each such corporation hereafter created or chartered by act of Congress, and each such corporation heretofore so created or chartered, still in existence, and by the terms of its charter a corporation not for profit, is to be subject to an annual audit of its financial transactions by a certified public accountant, at the expense of such corporation. Such annual audit shall be filed with the General Accounting Office, and retained by that office as a public record for a minimum period of 10 years, in accordance with such regulations and upon such forms as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General. A report on such audit is to be made to the Congress by the General Accounting Office.

SEC. 2. (a) This section is enacted by the Congress as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

(b) Any committee to which is referred a bill to provide for the creation or chartering of a corporation other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof, may refer such bill to the Attorney General for an investigation and report pursuant to section 4 of this act.

(c) No committee shall report a bill to provide for the creation or chartering of a corporation other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof, unless such bill is in conformity with the standards prescribed in section 3 of this act.

SEC. 3. A bill to provide for the creation or chartering of a corporation other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof, shall not be deemed to be in conformity with the standards prescribed in this section unless such bill—

(a) Clearly sets forth and defines the purposes of the corporation, showing such purposes to be in accord with the policy set forth in subparagraph (a) of section 1 of this act.

(b) Provides that no part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any of its members, directors, or officers, or be distributable thereto, otherwise than upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation.

(c) Provides that the corporation, and its officers and directors as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for elective public office.

(d) Sets forth—

(1) the name of the corporation, which shall be in the English language, shall not be the same as the name of (A) any corporation, whether for profit or not for profit, existing under any act of Congress or of any State, or (B) any foreign corporation, whether for profit or not for profit, authorized to transact its business or conduct its affairs in any State or in the District of Columbia, and shall not contain any word or phrase which indicates or implies that the corporation is organized for any purpose other than the specified purpose or purposes of the corporation;

(2) the period of duration, which may be perpetual;

(3) the name and address of each incorporator;

(4) the number of directors constituting the first board of directors, and the name and address of each such director;

(5) the place where such corporation is to be located and the place or places in which its activities are to be conducted;

(6) specific provisions with respect to the right of the members or any class or classes of members to vote or otherwise participate in the management of the corporation; and

(7) provision for distribution of assets upon dissolution or final liquidation: *Provided*, That such provisions shall not be deemed to violate the provisions of this act or of the corporate charter against the distribution of income to members, directors, or officers.

(e) Grants to the corporation the power to—

(1) have succession by its corporate name;

(2) sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(3) adopt, use, and alter a corporate seal;

(4) choose such officers, managers, and agents as the business of the corporation may require;

(5) ordain and establish bylaws and regulations, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State in which such corporation is to operate for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(6) contract and be contracted with;

(7) take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real or personal, necessary for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State (A) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by, or (B) other-

wise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by, a corporation operating in such State;

(8) transfer and convey real or personal property; and

(9) borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, and issue bonds therefor, and secure same by mortgage subject in every case to all applicable provisions of Federal or State law.

(f) Specifies that the corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers and agents.

(g) Provides that the corporation shall have in the District of Columbia at all times a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for such corporation; and that notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to or service upon the corporation.

(h) Contains provisions, in conformity with this act, respecting the annual audit of the books and records of the corporation by a certified public accountant pursuant to section 5 of this act.

(i) Provides for the officers of the corporation, and for a democratic method of election thereof.

(j) Contains a reservation to the Congress of the right to alter, repeal, or amend the act chartering such corporation.

(k) Requires that the corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account and shall also keep minutes of the proceedings of its members, board of directors, and committees having any of the authority of the board of directors; and shall keep at its registered office or principal office a record giving the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote; and provides that all books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose at any reasonable time.

(l) Provides that the corporation shall not have or issue shares of stock, nor declare or pay dividends.

(m) Provides that no loans shall be made by the corporation to its officers or directors, or any of them, and further provides that any directors of the corporation who vote for or assent to the making of a loan or advance to an officer or director of the corporation, and any officer or officers participating in the making of any such loan or advance, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such loan until the repayment thereof.

(n) Contains no provision for exemption from taxation of the corporation or its property, real or personal, or its income, or relative to or establishing the tax deductibility of gifts or donations to the corporation.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General is authorized and directed, in any case where there is referred to him by a standing committee of either House of the Congress a bill to provide for the creation or chartering of a corporation other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof, to conduct or cause to be conducted a full and complete investigation of the proposed corporation, its purposes, incorporators, and proponents, and any other matters in connection therewith which he shall elect to include in such investigation, and to make a full and complete report thereon which report shall be transmitted to the committee which referred such bill to the Attorney General, accompanied by the opinion of the Attorney General as to whether such bill and the corporation thereby proposed to be created or chartered are in compliance with this act, together with the recommendations of the Attorney General with respect to the enactment of the proposed legislation.

SEC. 5. (a) The financial transactions of each corporation (other than a corporation wholly owned or controlled by the United States or a department or agency thereof)

hereafter created or chartered by act of Congress, or heretofore so created or chartered, still in existence, and by the terms of its charter a corporation not for profit, shall be audited annually by a certified public accountant in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the respective corporations are normally kept. The certified public accountant, or his representatives, shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the respective corporations and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians.

(b) Each such corporation shall file annually with the Comptroller General, in accordance with such regulations and upon such form as he shall prescribe, a complete statement of such annual audit (which audit shall be retained by the General Accounting Office as a public record for a minimum period of 10 years), verified by the certified public accountant by whom the audit is made, for the fiscal year ending on June 30. Not later than January 15, following the close of such fiscal year for which such audit is made and such statement filed, the Comptroller General shall make a report to the Congress. Such report shall set forth the scope of the audit and statements of (1) assets and liabilities, (2) capital and surplus or deficit, (3) surplus or deficit analysis, (4) income and expense, and (5) sources and application of funds; and shall also include such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep Congress informed of the operations and financial conditions of, and the use of any Government funds and facilities by, each such corporation, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable. The report may also show specifically any program, expenditure, or other financial transaction or undertaking disclosed by the audit, which, in the opinion of the Comptroller General, has been carried on or made without authority of law or in violation of law or is not within the scope of the expressed corporate purposes or is not in conformity with this act. A copy of each such report shall be furnished to the corporation concerned at the time such report is submitted to the Congress.

(c) If the Comptroller General is unable to report fully on any such corporation as required by subsection (b) because of the willful failure of such corporation to comply with this section or with any reasonable regulation of the Comptroller General as authorized by this section, the facts of such willful failure on the part of any such corporation shall be fully reported to the Congress by the Comptroller General.

(d) For the purpose of supervising such audits or any audit and reporting to Congress thereon, the Comptroller General is authorized in his discretion to employ by contract, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, professional services of persons, firms, and organizations for temporary periods or for special purposes.

SEC. 6. The right of the Congress in its discretion to grant or withhold Federal charters for corporations is expressly reserved, and compliance with any or all provisions of this act by any corporation or other applicant or applicants for any Federal charter shall not be deemed to create or imply any obligation on the part of the Congress to grant or approve such charter.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to any corporation in existence at the date of approval of this act, whose

financial transactions are subject to audit, examination, or supervision by a department, agency, or official of the United States, District of Columbia, or State or Territory of the United States, and which corporation is required by law enacted by the Congress of the United States to file at least annually a financial report with such auditing, examining, or supervising department, agency, or official, nor to any religious, educational, or charitable corporation in existence at the date of the approval of this act, the major part of whose activities are local to the District of Columbia.

SEC. 8. For purposes of court jurisdiction based upon diversity of citizenship a corporation created by or under an act of Congress shall be deemed to be a citizen of Maryland, unless otherwise specified by act of Congress.

BILL PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Over, by request. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

I. N. NORMAN

The bill (S. 1107) for the relief of I. N. Norman was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] to make an explanation of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the bill is to compensate a gentleman now 75 or 76 years of age—he was about 70 years of age, I believe, at the time the accident occurred—who was riding in a small pick-up truck belonging to him, and driven by his minor daughter at a time when that truck was run over by an Army bus from Camp Blanding, Fla., which at the time was occupied by the American military forces. The driver of the bus was on official duty. He was a member of the military personnel.

The report of the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Pace, which sets up the physical facts, clearly admits the fact that the Army driver was negligent, and that there is no question about it. There is no claim either that the amount allowed by the committee is out of line. The only claim that I understand has been made by anyone, as against this particular bill, is the fact that the claimant could have brought suit under the Federal Tort Claims Act, and it is to that feature that I will address myself briefly, with the clear understanding that I am perfectly willing to reply to any other question on any other phase of the matter.

Mr. President, on that question of why the claimant did not bring suit under the Federal Tort Claims Act, I will say that my own file shows affirmatively, that he did not know of the passage of that act; and the very date of the accident shows that at the time the accident hap-

pened and at the time the damage was incurred the Federal Tort Claims Act did not exist. The accident occurred near Starke, Fla., on August 4, 1945. The act was passed later, and was made retroactive to January 1, 1945.

In the meantime the claimant had taken up his claim in a larger amount, incidentally, than the committee has approved, with the commanding officer at Camp Blanding, who, proceeding under a mistake as to what authority he had, apparently approved the claim in some amount, though the correspondence does not show in exactly what amount.

The correspondence which the Senator from Florida now holds in his hand is signed by Reginald Field, major, JAGD, and Assistant Chief of the Claims Division, of the War Department. This letter is dated June 27, 1946. Writing to the injured citizen, the claimant in this case, Major Field agrees that the claim is valid, and allows it in the amounts of the damage to the car and the medical expenses, and then continues with this statement, to which I particularly call attention; and I quote from the letter of the Judge Advocate General:

There is no statute or appropriation available to the War Department for payment of claims for loss of earnings and pain and suffering incident to personal injury resulting from accidents involving Army vehicles. These items were therefore necessarily disapproved.

At the time the officer made that statement, of course, he was correct. At the time the claim was being considered, the statement was correct. It happens, however, that the Congress in its judgment passed the Federal Tort Claims Act later, and made it retroactive so far back as to have included the date of the occurrence of this particular incident.

Mr. President, there is no doubt about the seriousness of the injury. Four of the vertebrae were broken, and the medical certificate shown to the committee established that fact. The Senator from Florida is willing to answer as to any other features of the claim that may be brought out at this time.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. I think the only question which is involved is whether or not a precedent would be established for waiving the statute of limitations under the Tort Claims Act. As I understand the explanation of the Senator from Florida, this is a case which stands only on the facts presented in the case itself.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. NIXON. And the precedent would be limited to this case.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; it is also a case which could not be duplicated in any other instance, unless it were a case in which the damage had been sustained after January 1, 1945, the date from which the Federal Tort Claims Act was made effective—although by a bill passed long after that—and before the date of the passage of the act. The circumstances did occur, and the negotiations with the War Department took

place, prior to the time of the passage of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

Mr. NIXON. I have no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "\$6,268.90" and insert "\$5,140.40"; in line 9, after the word "owned", to strike out "and operated by the" and insert "I. N. Norman and in which"; and in line 10, after the word "Norman", to insert "was a passenger", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to I. N. Norman of Starke, Fla., the sum of \$5,140.40, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damages resulting from a collision between a United States Army truck and a truck owned by I. N. Norman and in which said I. N. Norman was a passenger, which occurred near Starke, Fla., on August 4, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1669) to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, with respect to payments for the benefit of persons under legal disability, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 6, after the word "discretion", to strike out "determine and"; in line 7, after the word "claimant", to strike out "who" and insert "whom the Commission may determine"; and in line 9, after the word "estate", to insert "for the use and benefit of such claimant or estate", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 U. S. C. 2004 (e)), is amended to read as follows:

"(e) Any claim allowed by the Commission under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment out of the war claims funds established by section 13 of this act, and shall be payable by the Secretary of the Treasury to the person entitled thereto; except that where the person entitled to payment is under any legal disability, any part of the amount payable may, in the discretion of the Commission, be paid, for the use of the claimant, to the natural or legal guardian, committee, conservator, or curator of the claimant, or, if there is no such guardian, committee, conservator, or curator, then the Commission may, in its discretion, make payment to any other per-

son, including the spouse of such claimant, whom the Commission may determine is vested with the care of the claimant or his estate for the use and benefit of such claimant or estate; and if such person is a minor, any part of the amount payable may, in the discretion of the Commission, be paid to such minor."

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended (50 U. S. C. 2005 (c)), is amended by striking out "or to his legal or natural guardian if he has one,"; and such section 6 is further amended by inserting after subsection (c) thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Where any person entitled to payment under this section is under any legal disability, payment may be made in accordance with the provisions of subsection (e) of section 5."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WLADIMIR PETER LEWICKI ET AL.—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 744) for the relief of Wladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. Since it was placed on the calendar advice has come to us that a further investigation is being made. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may go over, with the understanding that it may be called on the next calendar call, at which time we shall have advice from the authorities with respect to the further investigation which is now being made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MAJ. BRUCE B. CALKINS

The bill (H. R. 828) for the relief of Maj. Bruce B. Calkins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES J. LIEBERMAN

The bill (H. R. 1688) for the relief of James J. Lieberman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WALTER M. SMITH

The bill (H. R. 4226) for the relief of Walter M. Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN S. DOWNING

The bill (H. R. 4269) for the relief of John S. Downing was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILCOX ELECTRIC CO., INC.

The bill (H. R. 1912) for the relief of Wilcox Electric Co., Inc., was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question with reference to this bill. If the bill becomes law, will the \$104,121.52 be subject to a tax?

Mr. McCARRAN. The question has been asked whether the amount provided to be paid under the bill will be taxable as current income. In reply

I can only say that in my opinion it would be so taxable, and that it is the intention of the Judiciary Committee in reporting the bill that the sum in question should be taxable.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the figures "\$104,121.52", to insert "less appropriate tax adjustments to the extent that the said company has benefited from this loss in computing its Federal excess-profits tax and income-tax liability for any year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

LOAN WEAVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2771) for the relief of Lon Weaver, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the numerals "1940", to strike out the comma and "until the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia ordered his release."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

THOMAS A. TRULOVE, POSTMASTER, AND NOLEN J. SALYARDS, ASSISTANT POSTMASTER, INGLEWOOD, CALIF.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 745) for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif., which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "postmaster", to strike out the comma and "and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, California, are" and insert "at Inglewood, California, is"; and in line 10, after the word "postmaster", to strike out "and assistant postmaster."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster at Inglewood, California."

DESIGNATION OF ORGANIZATIONS AS SUCCESSORS IN INTEREST TO DECEASED PERSONS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1748) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, with reference to the designation of organizations as successors in interest to deceased persons, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on request of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I object.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I ask the Senator from Florida if he knows whether or not the objection of the Senator from New Mexico is to any particular provision of the bill, so that we may be prepared to meet it. The reason I ask is that there is an important time factor involved, and I am wondering whether the Senator is aware of the nature of the objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry that I cannot give the Senator the information which he requests. The majority leader [Mr. McFARLAND], was called out of the Chamber a few minutes ago, and he left this request with me. It had been lodged with him by the senior Senator from New Mexico. I am simply placing it in the Record at this time. I am sorry that I cannot give the Senator the information he desires.

Mr. O'CONOR. The only reason I ask is that the bill has to do with the rights of a number of persecuted peoples. As I previously stated, there is a time factor involved. I hope the Senator will cooperate with me in ascertaining the reasons for the objection, so that at a later date we may meet them.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure that the Senator from New Mexico will be glad to state to the Senator from Maryland just what his objection is. The Senator from Florida does not have the information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

CLAIMS BY PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY EVACUATED UNDER MILITARY ORDERS

The bill (H. R. 3142) to authorize the settlement by the Attorney General and the payment of certain of the claims filed under the Act of July 2, 1948, by persons of Japanese ancestry evacuated under military orders, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 304 OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949 AND SECTION 4 OF THE ARMED SERVICES PROCUREMENT ACT OF 1947

The bill (S. 921) to amend section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 304 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 4 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 are hereby amended by inserting at the end of the above-named sections the following new subsection:

"(c) All contracts negotiated without advertising pursuant to authority contained in this Act shall include a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall have access to and the right

to examine any pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts."

CHANGE OF NAME OF RESERVOIR TO LAKE THOMPSON

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) to change the name of the reservoir to be formed above Garrison Dam and known as Garrison Reservoir or Garrison Lake to Lake Thompson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the reservoir, known as Garrison Reservoir or Garrison Lake, which is to be located above the Garrison Dam in North Dakota, shall hereafter be known as Lake Thompson and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is designated or referred to under the name Garrison Reservoir or Garrison Lake shall be held to refer to such reservoir under and by the name of Lake Thompson.

DESIGNATION OF LAKE AS LAKE UMATILLA

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to designate the lake to be formed by the McNary Lock and Dam in the Columbia River, Oregon and Washington, as Lake Umatilla, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the lake which will be created by the construction of McNary Lock and Dam in the Columbia River between the States of Oregon and Washington shall hereafter be known as Lake Umatilla, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such lake is designated or referred to under any other name shall be held to refer to such reservoir under and by the name of Lake Umatilla.

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION AND SURVEY OF LAS VEGAS WASH, NEV.

The bill (S. 1020) to authorize a preliminary examination and survey for flood-control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas, Nev., and vicinity, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey for flood-control and allied purposes of Las Vegas Wash and its tributaries, Las Vegas and vicinity, Nevada, to be made under direction of the Chief of Engineers, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made for runoff and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention on such drainage area, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes.

CONVEYANCE OF ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY EASEMENTS IN DE KALB AND PUTNAM COUNTIES, TENN.

The bill (S. 1710) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain road right-of-way easements in De Kalb and Putnam Counties, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the State

of Tennessee, without reimbursement, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those certain road right-of-way easements over lands in De Kalb and Putnam Counties, Tenn., acquired by the United States for use as an access road to the Center Hill Dam and Reservoir, all as set out on sheets 4 to 18, inclusive, of highway drawing dated March 1942, designated as "Right Bank Access Road—Dam Site to Silver Point" on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER TOLL BRIDGE NEAR BURLINGTON, IOWA

The bill (H. R. 4332) to authorize the city of Burlington, Iowa, to own, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near said city, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JURY TRIALS IN CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS IN UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

The bill (S. 1958) to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I believe the Senate should have an explanation of the bill.

The Senate previously on July 11, 1951, unanimously passed Senate Joint Resolution 82, which would have enacted into law rule 71 (a) of the rules of civil procedure as promulgated by the Supreme Court on May 1, 1951. This rule had to do with procedure in condemnation proceedings, and in its enactment of the rule the Senate deleted that portion of the rule which reposed the question of jury trials within the discretion of the trial court. The House amended Senate Joint Resolution 82, and the Senate unanimously agreed to some of the amendments by the House but disagreed to one other amendment, which would have extended the effective date of rule 71 (a) to April 1, 1952. In view of the fact that there was only 1 day left in which to have a conference and get the bill to the President before the rule went into effect by operation of law by August 1, 1951, there was not sufficient time within which to iron out the matter. Thus, rule 71 (a) became effective on August 1, 1951. The instant bill amends subdivision (h) of the present rule so that on demand therefor parties in interest in a condemnation proceeding may request and have a jury trial on the issue of just compensation. This bill only amends that rule so as to give to litigants a trial by jury as a matter of right, as opposed to the proposition that they may have a jury trial within the discretion of the court.

The committee is unanimous in its recommendation that the bill be considered favorably.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. CASE. There has been brought to my attention the question of whether or not the proposed 20-day period would be sufficient for pending actions. On page 2, line 19, of the bill, it provides that 20 days shall be the time within

which a jury trial may be demanded. I wonder, in view of the inquiries which have been made, if the Senator would agree to change the time from 20 days to 30 days.

Mr. McCARRAN. Except that inquiry was made of the Department of Justice as to whether 20 days would be sufficient, and the Department said 20 days would be sufficient. If the Senator feels that it would be better to provide 30 days, I have no objection to such a change being made.

Mr. CASE. I offer an amendment on page 2, line 19, to strike out the word "twenty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "thirty."

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) chapter 121 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 1875. Condemnation proceedings.

"Notwithstanding the provisions of subdivision (h) of rule 71A of the Rules of Civil Procedure, any party to an action in a district court involving the exercise of the power of eminent domain under the law of the United States may have a trial by jury of the issue of just compensation, except where a tribunal has been specially constituted by an act of Congress governing the case for the determination of that issue, by filing a demand therefor within the time allowed by such rule for answer or within such further time as the court may fix."

(b) The analysis at the beginning of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1875. Condemnation proceedings."

Sec. 2. Section 1875 of title 28 of the United States Code shall apply to (a) actions commenced after the date of enactment of this act, (b) actions pending on the date of enactment of this act in which the time for requesting a jury trial under the applicable provisions of law in effect immediately prior to August 1, 1951, had not expired prior to August 1, 1951, and (c) actions pending on the date of enactment of this act which were commenced subsequent to July 31, 1951; but the time within which a jury trial may be demanded under such section in any case referred to in clause (b) or clause (c) above shall be 30 days after the date of enactment of this act in lieu of the time prescribed in such section.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I understand that House Joint Resolution 311 making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952 has come over from the House. It provides for Mexican labor. While all members of the Committee on Appropriations have not been heard from, because we have not had a full meeting of the committee, I consulted 10 or 12 members of the committee, and they said they had no objection to a unanimous-consent request that the joint resolution be passed. It provides \$950,000 to carry out the provisions of the act recently passed with reference to Mexican labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder whether the Senator would renew his request after the call of the calendar has been concluded. We are about through with the calendar call. Will he renew his request at the end of the calendar call?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly. I would suggest that the Senator look over the joint resolution in the meantime.

JUAN SUSTARSIC

This bill (S. 588) for the relief of Juan Sustarsic was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Juan Sustarsic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

POLLY ANNE CALDWELL

The bill (S. 626) for the relief of Polly Anne Caldwell was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Polly Anne Caldwell, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sergeant and Mrs. Fred W. Caldwell, citizens of the United States.

ELIZABETH BOZSIK

The bill (S. 1718) for the relief of Elizabeth BozsiK was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Elizabeth BozsiK shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SAMUEL A. WISE

The bill (S. 1741) for the relief of Samuel A. Wise was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel A. Wise, of Dover, Del., the sum of \$65.30 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of (1) the sum of \$45 paid by him in satisfaction of a judgment rendered against him as a result of his damaging a privately owned vehicle while driving a Government-owned vehicle in the performance of his duties as an engineering aide, and (2) the sum of \$20.30 paid by him for court costs and attorney's fees in connection with such judgment: *Provided, That*

no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

ADAM STYKA AND WANDA ENGEMAN STYKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 607) for the relief of Adam Styka and Wanda Engeman Styka which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Adam Styka and Wanda Engeman Styka shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1770) to amend the Administrative Procedure Act and eliminate exemptions therefrom was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on leaving the chamber a few minutes ago the majority leader requested me to state that, because of the importance of the bill, he felt it should be discussed other than on a call of the calendar. I therefore object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill goes over.

ROY F. WILSON

The bill (H. R. 796) for the relief of Roy F. Wilson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS G. FABINYI

The bill (H. R. 1581) for the relief of Thomas G. Fabinyi was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. ALFRED PULLIAM

The bill (H. R. 2275) for the relief of J. Alfred Pulliam was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I believe the amount involved requires an explanation for the RECORD.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill awards the sum of \$17,000 to a claimant who was seriously injured in an accident involving a Navy bus and an Army truck which occurred in Hawaii in 1944. The claimant, as an employee of the

Navy, was properly riding as a passenger in the Navy bus at the time of the accident.

The Department of the Army reports that said accident was caused solely by the negligence of the driver of the Army truck, and makes no objection to reimbursement of the claimant for the personal injuries which he suffered. The sum provided in the bill represents a finding of the House Committee on the Judiciary as to what constitutes a fair and reasonable award in the circumstances of this case, with which the Senate committee concurs.

The committee therefore recommends favorable consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PANAGIOTA KOLINTZA KARKALATOS

The bill (H. R. 2369) for the relief of Panagiota Kolintza Karkalatos was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS G. DIGGES

The bill (H. R. 2550) for the relief of Thomas G. Digges was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANE AND MARTHA CLARK

The bill (H. R. 3151) for the relief of Jane and Martha Clark, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE S. PASCHKE

The bill (H. R. 3966) for the relief of George S. Paschke was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MAUD M. WRIGHT AND MRS. MAXINE ROBERTS, FORMERLY MRS. MAXINE MILLS

The bill (H. R. 4246) for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Roberts, formerly Mrs. Maxine Mills, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANZ FURTNER, HIS WIFE VALENTINA FURTNER, AND HER DAUGHTERS, NINA TUERCK AND VICTORIA TUERCK

The bill (H. R. 617) for the relief of Franz Furtner, his wife Valentina Furtner, and her daughters, Nina Tuerck and Victoria Tuerck, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Acting President of the Senate, now that the call of the calendar has been concluded, whether any bills were placed at the foot of the calendar which Senators might now wish to call up. Has that all been taken care of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that no bills were placed

at the foot of the calendar. The call of the calendar has been concluded.

CONFIRMATION OF NAVY NOMINATIONS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably several military nominations. Included in them are several appointments made necessary in the Navy by the reason of the untimely death of Admiral Sherman.

In order that the nominations to these top offices in the Navy may be confirmed quickly, so that the nominees may promptly assume their new positions, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate consider and confirm the following nominations, and that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmations:

Admiral William M. Fechteler, to be Chief of Naval Operations.

Vice Adm. Donald B. Duncan, to be Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral while so serving.

Admiral Lynde D. McCormick, to be commander in chief, Atlantic and United States Atlantic Fleet.

Rear Adm. James Fife, Jr., to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. President, it is most important that these nominations be confirmed today. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, they be confirmed at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, would it be agreeable to the Senator from Virginia to have other nominations on the calendar considered at this time?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection to having all the nominations on the calendar called, if that is desired. If the remainder of the calendar is not to be called, I should like to ask some questions about the nominations referred to by the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that these nominations are now being reported; they are not on the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to having the nominations considered at this time. One of the nominees will replace Admiral Sherman, I understand.

Mr. BYRD. Yes; that is Admiral Fechteler; and the other nominations are incidental to the death of Admiral Sherman.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, ordinarily I should think the nominations should lie over until the next day. However, in view of the fact that, as I understand, there is an emergency, and in view of the fact that the office Admiral Sherman held is now vacant, and that it is most urgent that it be filled at the earliest possible moment, I have no objection.

However, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Virginia if it is true that at least all members of the committee who were present, representing both sides of the aisle, voted unanimously in favor of the adoption of a

resolution calling for the reporting of the nominations, and also requested that the distinguished Senator from Virginia ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the nominations be confirmed today.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is correct. The committee adopted a resolution, requesting that the nominations be confirmed, and a unanimous report in favor of confirmation of the nominations has been made by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed, and the President will be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nominations.

The nominations confirmed are as follows:

Admiral William M. Fechteler, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral for a term of 4 years.

Vice Admiral Donald B. Duncan, United States Navy, to be Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral while so serving.

Admiral Lynde D. McCormick, United States Navy, to be commander in chief, Atlantic and United States Atlantic Fleet, with the rank of admiral while so serving.

Rear Admiral James Fife, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations).

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD—NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand that the Navy nominations, reported just a minute ago, have now been confirmed.

There are on the executive calendar three nominations which have been passed over for some time. However, I understand there is no objection to them now.

I ask unanimous consent that as in executive session, the three nominations to the Subversive Activities Control Board be considered and confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The nominations confirmed are as follows:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Peter Campbell Brown, of New York, member, term of 2 years. (Appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

David J. Coddalre, of Massachusetts, member, term of 1 year. (Appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

Kathryn McHale, of Indiana, member, term of 1 year. (Appointed during the recess of the Senate.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Russell E. Wood and James A. Hirschfeld, for promotion to the permanent rank of rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard; and

Peter V. Colmar, and sundry other persons for appointment in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Monroe Davis Dowling, of New York, N. Y., to be collector of internal revenue for the third district of New York, vice James W. Johnson; and

Katherine D. Nordale, of Juneau, Alaska, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 31, with headquarters at Juneau, Alaska, in place of James J. Connors, resigned.

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

General of the Army Omar Nelson Bradley, United States Army, for appointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Department of Defense (reappointment);

Brig. Gen. Claude Henry Chorpensing, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as assistant to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and as brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States;

Col. John D. Billingsley for appointment as professor of ordnance, United States Military Academy;

Maj. Gen. Raymond Hartwell Fleming, National Guard of the United States, Army of the United States, to be Chief of the National Guard Bureau, with the rank of major general;

Maj. Charles David Thomas Lennhoff, Maj. Frank Thomas Hold, Capt. Lysle Iver Abbott, and Capt. James Clyde Waller, Jr., for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States;

Paul DeWitt Adams and sundry other officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Leslie A. Kniskern and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the grade of rear admiral in the Navy;

Norman R. Gearhart and sundry other persons for appointment in the Navy; and

Thomas J. Cushman and several other officers for temporary appointment to the grade of major general in the Marine Corps.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I now renew my request for unanimous consent to have the Senate consider the joint resolution to which I referred a few minutes ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee first to explain the joint resolution, which he will do in any event, I am sure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, I am glad to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I should like to ask the Senator to tell the Senate once again whether in this case there is such an emergency that the House joint resolution cannot at least be considered by

the full membership of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. The reason is that the Department does not have sufficient funds with which to proceed to undertake a function with which it is charged, and it must be undertaken promptly.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a very good reason.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the answer the Senator has given, and I respect him highly. However, sometimes that reason—a lack of money—is a good one why a measure should not be passed, of course.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, very frequently that is so; I agree entirely with the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, I read from the report:

The Department of Agriculture has ruled that all cotton stalks in the Lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas must be plowed under by September 16 in order to control the pink boll worm. Stalks in Laredo, Winter Garden, and Eagle Pass areas must be plowed under by October 1. In the Rio Grande Valley alone the crop, which is now being harvested, comprises approximately 900,000 acres, yielding about 700,000 bales. The domestic labor force will have to be augmented in these areas to prevent losses in this important crop.

Other Texas areas and the States of Arkansas, Arizona, Missouri, Louisiana, and New Mexico have requested and will require Mexican Nationals to harvest cotton, while California will require them beginning the middle of August for the fruit, vegetable, and cotton harvests, according to the testimony received by the committee.

The basic law requires that employers reimburse the Government in amounts up to \$15 per worker to cover the costs of transportation and subsistence en route and at reception centers. Of the \$950,000 recommended in this resolution \$750,000 is for a working fund to be reimbursed by these payments. The remaining \$200,000 is for administrative expenses, including operation of migration, or recruitment centers in Mexico, reception centers in the United States, and the costs of medical examinations for the workers.

The committee in reporting this interim appropriation expects the Department to assign only the skeleton forces necessary to begin partial operations, and not build up complete personnel complements until the Congress has considered and passed upon the full supplemental request for 1952 now pending before the committee.

That is the situation, and the Department must have the funds for that purpose. The House has passed the joint resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. When the Senator refers to "the committee"—

Mr. McKELLAR. I was referring to the House committee, not the Senate committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is what I thought. This matter has never been before the Senate committee; has it?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, it never has; although it has been before a subcommittee of another Senate committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Has it been before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, headed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I think not.

Mr. President, the following message is from the Secretary of Labor:

The Secretary called for you, and said to tell you that you would have before you today the joint resolution for a very prompt appropriation to take care of migrant Mexican labor. He said to please tell you that if you could get it out today, he would be deeply grateful. It is in the supplemental appropriation bill, Department of Labor, governing migrant foreign labor.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] spoke to me a few minutes ago and wanted to know whether this measure applies only to Mexican labor or whether it applies to foreign labor generally. I advised him that it applies only to Mexican labor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say that what I object to in this case—and I think the point was raised by the distinguished minority leader—is that this measure has come to us from the House of Representatives only today. It has not even been before either a subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee or before the full Senate Appropriations Committee. I do not believe there is any pressing need for the passage of this measure. It may be desirable and may have a great deal of merit, but I think the distinguished chairman of the committee will agree with me that this is not the way to legislate. Certainly this sort of high-pressure tactics by those down town to get measures enacted does not appeal to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not agree that it is high-pressured at all.

Mr. BRIDGES. I did not mean that the Senator is engaging in high-pressure tactics, but I meant that the Department is using high-pressure tactics.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Arizona tells me that a meeting is intended for tomorrow. I would be perfectly willing to have this measure brought up before the committee. The full committee is to meet tomorrow.

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; and following favorable action by the committee, the joint resolution could be taken up in the Senate on Monday. Certainly no emergency will develop in connection with this matter during the next 3 days.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes, although I should like to see prompt action taken on the joint resolution.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly. However, I do not think that a few days delay will do any harm. Therefore, I shall object to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

MORRIS KLEINMAN (S. RES. 119) AND LOUIS ROTHKOPF (S. RES. 120)—MOTIONS TO RECONSIDER

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is now our intention to take up the motions of the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] to reconsider the votes by which Senate Resolutions 119 and 120 were agreed to. I have conferred with the distinguished Senator

from Washington and with the distinguished Senators from Tennessee and Maryland, who tell me they have no objection to the adoption of the motions, with the express understanding that the resolutions be made the unfinished business, and disposed of immediately. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the motions be agreed to, and that the votes by which these two resolutions, Senate Resolution 119 and Senate Resolution 120, were agreed to, be reconsidered. I further ask that Senate Resolution 119 be made the unfinished business before the Senate, and that, following the disposition of Senate Resolution 119, Senate Resolution 120 be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DISCLOSURE OF NAMES OF PERSONS ALLEGED TO BE SECURITY RISKS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, last year I gave the Senate the names of 81 individuals whom I considered dangerous to this country, if allowed to remain in positions of power. At the time that was done, there were constant demands upon the floor of the Senate, many of them made by the then majority leader, former Senator Lucas, who is no longer a Member of the Senate, that I make the names public on the Senate floor. As I have stated, the majority leader was joined in this demand by a number of other Senators. At that time I refused to comply with the request, and explained why. I told the Senate I felt that, of the 81 cases given the Senate, some were marginal cases, in which the parties might well prove themselves to be neither bad security risks nor disloyal, and that for that reason I felt that the names should be given to the committee which was to be appointed, and should be given to it in private, and that then, after the committee had completed its investigation, it should decide which names were to be made public.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, statements by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and myself, explaining how it happened that certain names were made public.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXPLAINING WHY NAMES WERE MADE PUBLIC

1. Remarks of Senator HICKENLOOPER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 4, pages 4832-4833.

2. Remarks of Senator McCARTHY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 4, pages 4372-4373.

Senator HICKENLOOPER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 5, 1950:

"As a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations now engaged in the inquiry into the charges of the Senator from Wisconsin, I should like to say that on the day on which the Senator from Wisconsin made his speech at some length on the floor of the Senate, in which he referred to certain cases by number, and so forth—I think it was the 20th of February—at that time the Senator from Wisconsin repeatedly stated and restated on the

floor of the Senate that he did not want to make names public, that he would not tell the names to the Senate in public; and, time after time, the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, rose to demand that he give the names in public, so the whole country would know who the people were that were suspected.

"The Senator from Wisconsin repeatedly said, 'No, I will not make them public.' The Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Withers, rose and said he wanted to see the list of names. The Senator from Wisconsin said, 'Come to my office in the morning and I will show you the names.' The Senator from Kentucky said, 'Can I make them public? I intend to make them public if I see them.' The Senator from Wisconsin said, 'No; if you are going to make them public, I shall not give you the names.'

"The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with such statements on the question of the publicity of the names.

"It is a matter of fact also that the junior Senator from Massachusetts and I, both at the first executive meeting of the subcommittee, suggested and proposed the procedure, that the subcommittee meet in executive session, call the Senator from Wisconsin before it, and ask him to disclose the names in private, together with whatever information he had in connection with the names; but the majority of the subcommittee said no, this must be brought out in public. So they held their first hearing, requiring the Senator from Wisconsin to come, in public, to name the names. I tell the Senator that, if he is not familiar with it, merely to keep the factual history of the publicity of these names accurate.

"I should like to say also that so far as I am concerned, while we did not have the machinery to set up a court of inquiry such as the Canadian spy-ring case called for, we did propose and urge that an inquiry in secrecy without naming names be made with the facts collected. But we were overruled, and the Senator from Wisconsin was required, or requested, to come before the committee in public hearing, with klieg lights, television, and all the rest of the fanfare of such an emotional occasion, there to bring out his cases, name names, and produce facts."

Senator McCARTHY, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 30, 1950:

"There has been considerable criticism by a number of well-meaning people of the naming of names in public before the individuals have an opportunity to be heard.

"It might be well, therefore, to briefly cite the record as to why names have been named in public rather than in private. On the 20th of February, as the Senate will recall, I gave to the Senate in some detail 81 cases of individuals whom I stated the files indicated ranged all the way from being bad security risks to very dangerous individuals.

"At that time I pointed out that perhaps some of these individuals would be able to produce facts to offset the effect of the material in the files and show that they were actually loyal employees. I stated in effect—and while I have not had an opportunity to check the number of times in the RECORD, my office tells me that I did so over a dozen times—that I would consider it extremely improper and unfair to name names in public before the individuals had a chance to appear in executive session.

"The leader of the Democratic Party, Mr. Lucas, however, on five separate occasions, demanded that the names be publicly named. His first demand was on page 1953 of the RECORD. Again, on page 1955, he had this to say:

"I want to remain here until he names them. That is what I am interested in."

"Again, on page 1959, he said:

"Will the Senator tell us the name of the man for the RECORD. We are entitled to

know who he is. I say this in all seriousness."

"Again, on page 1963, he said:

"The Senator should name names before that committee."

"Again, on page 1973, he said:

"Why does the Senator refuse to divulge names before the Senate?"

"Mr. Withers, also, on almost countless occasions heckled me for the names, stating, on page 1973:

"Does the Senator realize that I, like all others, am curious to know the names? When the Senator gives the cases the people and the country at large are entitled to know who they are."

"At that time I, in answer to the urging of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Kentucky, stated that I would not give the names in public unless a majority of the Senate demanded that they be made public, and this is all a matter of record.

"After the committee had been appointed and Senator Tydings made chairman, he saw me on the floor of the Senate and stated that a public hearing had been scheduled and asked if I would be ready to appear and testify. At that time I urged that the hearings be in executive session and reminded him of the statements which I made on the Senate floor.

"He informed me that the first hearings would be public and that later we would go into executive session. Later I was informed by the press that Mr. Tydings had made a statement that I could present my cases as I saw fit.

"I again contacted him and told him that, if such were the case, I thought the names should be given in executive session, but was again informed that the first hearings would be public.

"I then contacted my colleague, Senator HICKENLOOPER, and told him that while I thought this might be good politics for the majority members of the committee because of the position in which it would place me, that it was so unfair to some of the individuals who might be able to produce evidence giving them a clean bill of health something should be done.

"Senator HICKENLOOPER informed me there was nothing that he or Senator LONG could do because Senator Tydings had made the announcement that the first hearings would be open and it was not even brought to a vote, inasmuch as Senator McMAHON and Senator GREEN so obviously went along with him.

"At the time of the first public hearing, after I had begun to testify, and had already passed out to the members of the press the first case covering Judge Kenyon, Senator Tydings then told me that if I cared to, we would go into executive session.

"He, of course, knew full well that to go into executive session, so far as the Kenyon case was concerned, would be meaningless after I had commenced the case and handed the evidence thereon to the press.

"I had tried to make it clear that the Kenyon case was presented as one of a sequence which I had hoped to present the first morning, if I had been allowed to proceed. I felt that it was important, not so much from the standpoint of Judge Kenyon, but rather as a typical case to show the complete incompetence of the Loyalty Board for the reason that in this case the files contained more than 28 documents showing membership in organizations listed as subversive or Communist-front—that regardless of this, the Loyalty Board never even went through the motions of asking the judge for an explanation as to why she joined these organizations, which the Secretary of State himself had stated were evidence that an employee was a bad security risk.

"After being held to the Kenyon case by petty bickering for 2 days during which,

according to my staff, I occupied approximately 5 percent of the time, the committee adjourned over the week end and stated that Judge Kenyon would be called as a witness.

"The chairman of the committee then magnanimously offered that the other cases which I was prepared to present the first day be given in executive session. I do not condemn or criticize the chairman for this maneuver. Politically, it was extremely clever. However, after presenting one case to show how the Loyalty Board worked, a case which happened to be a woman, it would seem unusual in the extreme that the committee retire into executive session to consider the cases of these prominent State Department officials in whose activities the public was so vitally interested.

"I might say that while at the time I felt that the Senator from Illinois was wholly wrong in demanding the names be made public and while I originally was very much disturbed by Senator Tydings' very clever maneuvering of the names into public print, I am not too sure that perhaps some good has not been accomplished.

"After all, an individual who takes a high Government position must realize that for the good of the country his actions and motives should be subjected to the closest scrutiny. After all, the aims and objectives of the group who have been formulating a rather disastrous far eastern policy should be subjected publicly to a cold and searching light. Therefore, I am not too sure that the Senate majority leader and the chairman of the committee may not have performed a service to the country when one insisted that the names be made public and the other maneuvered those names into the public press."

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, as was pointed out so clearly by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], former Senator Tydings, then chairman of the subcommittee making the investigation, who is no longer with us, insisted that the first sessions be held in public, and consequently about 9 or 10 of the 81 names were made public. Since that time I have been trying to follow the progress of the individual cases which were given to the Tydings committee, 81 in number, plus 25 additional names which were developed during the hearing. I found that a considerable number had been cleared by the State Department, 28, to be exact; and, at a later time, I intend to read into the RECORD the dates of their clearance. Another list of 29 names is still pending before the Loyalty Security Board. As to the remainder, nothing was done.

In the 29 cases, what is known as "letters of charges" have been filed. Those letters of charges were not filed by McCARTHY, they were not filed by anyone outside the Department. They were filed as the result of adverse information developed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation or by some of the State Department investigators. How to describe "letters of charges" best I do not know, except to say that the best analogy perhaps would be that of an information filed by a district attorney, or perhaps an indictment returned by a grand jury. The fact that letters of charges have been filed against these 29 individuals does not necessarily mean that all of them are guilty of the charges. Some of them may well be able to prove their innocence.

Incidentally, Mr. President, there is no doubt that they will all be cleared. The State Department's Loyalty Board has a very unusual record. In 4 years of operation, with hundreds and hundreds of cases coming before the Board, cases which came before the Board as the result of investigations conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the State Department's Loyalty Board has not found a single man unfit for Government service.

The Commerce Department comes next. The Commerce Department has found somewhat less than 7 percent of the cases which came before its Loyalty Board unfit for Government service. However, that record is not so bad as it may look, because Secretary Sawyer, upon his own authority, discharged a number of questionable characters before their cases even came before the Loyalty Board.

I think we can safely say that all these individuals will be cleared, as they were cleared by the Tydings committee last year.

Upon learning that these individuals were formally charged, Mr. President, I wrote to former Senator Hiram Bingham, who succeeded Seth Richardson as Chairman of the Civil Service Loyalty Review Board, and asked him whether he would confirm the information which I already had as to which cases were pending. Under date of June 13 he wrote me confirming the information which I had. This letter is available to any Senator who indicates a desire to see it.

I then found that all these individuals, even though they had been formally charged with communistic activities, still, as of this moment, have access to top secret and other classified material in the State Department. I accordingly wrote the State Department and made a very, very reasonable request. I wrote them under date of July 23, 1951. I ask that this letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks, omitting the list of names contained in the letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 23, 1951.

MR. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I would appreciate receiving information as to the status of the following 29 cases which I understand are pending before the State Department's loyalty board:

I would also appreciate knowing—

1. Whether the above individuals have access to classified material while their cases are pending;

2. Whether letters of charges have been filed in all of the above cases.

A short time ago when it was announced that the cases of John Paton Davies and Oliver Clubb had been reopened and they had been suspended, the State Department announced that, under the law, suspension was mandatory. I thereupon wrote the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission Loyalty Board and asked him why others whose cases were pending before the Loyalty Board, such as John Carter Vincent and Philip Jessup, and so forth, were not also suspended. The Chairman wrote me under date of July

16, stating that the law does not make suspension mandatory, but leaves the question of suspension entirely within the discretion of the Secretary of State. Do you so understand the law?

If steps have been taken to deny individuals such as Vincent, Jessup, and others whom I have named above, access to secret and other classified State Department material I would appreciate being so informed. If no such steps have been taken, I would appreciate receiving your comments as to whether you consider it safe practice to give individuals being investigated for Communist activities free access to State Department material of such a secret nature that it is not available to Members of the Congress.

Unless I receive your immediate assurance that steps will be taken to deny access to secret material to those whose cases are pending before your loyalty board and those who have been formally charged with Communist activities, I shall feel forced to bring the individual cases to the attention of the public with the hope that public opinion may force sensible action on your part.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

Mr. McCARTHY. In that letter I called to the Secretary of State's attention the very dangerous practice of giving these individuals access to secret material after they had been charged with communistic activity. To my mind, it is like a man who is indicted for embezzlement having completely free access to the funds of the bank while he is being tried.

I told the Secretary of State that unless he would assure me that these persons would be denied access to secret material until his own loyalty board would clear them, I felt I had no choice but to bring the cases to the attention of the Senate and give the Senate a résumé of the "letters of charges" filed against them, hoping that action by the Senate or perhaps public opinion would make the Secretary change his policy and adopt a sensible, safe attitude.

I received from the Secretary's office, under date of July 25, a very arrogant letter in which he indicated that he thought it was no business of the Senate, that the State Department is his own little private kingdom where he can do what he pleases, and he refused to assure me that these men would be denied access to secret material.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, July 25, 1951.

The Honorable JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR McCARTHY: As the officer in charge of the operation of the loyalty and security program of the Department of State, I am answering your letter to the Secretary of July 23.

You begin your letter by stating that it is your understanding that the 29 individuals whom you list are "cases . . . pending before the State Department's Loyalty Board." Your understanding is incorrect. The 29 individuals—all of whom you have cited, of course, in your former lists—fall into varying categories. Like your previous lists, this one also includes the names of persons who are not employees of the De-

partment of State, employees who have been cleared by the Department's Loyalty Security Board, as well as individuals in process through the loyalty program. Your indiscriminate lumping together of names and the threat to make them public is tantamount to holding hostage the reputation and rights of those employees who have been or may be cleared of the allegations against them. The President's directive of March 13, 1948 (Federal Register, March 16, 1948) precludes me from furnishing any reports, records, or files relative to the loyalty of employees. Disclosure of such information would be prejudicial both to these people as individuals and to the Government's ability to conduct a sound, just, and honorable loyalty security program.

Let me once again remind you that the Department of State is operating under the loyalty program laid down by the President in Executive Order No. 9835, as amended by Executive Order No. 10241. This Executive order, which anyone interested in our national security safeguards should feel duty-bound to study, prescribes a loyalty system which even the most critical have endorsed. This system offers as much protection to the Government as any ethical and American system which could be devised. That it is subject to attack for purely political reasons without regard for the facts is unfortunate.

The Department of State, operating under the authorities of the so-called McCarran security rider and Public Law 733, carries out a total security program. When I say total, I mean total: If an individual is found to be a security risk, he is separated from the Department.

Now, the following points with regard to the Department's loyalty and security program have been said many times, but I will repeat them again for your benefit as simply and as briefly as possible.

1. Both the loyalty and security programs of the Department are under my immediate supervision, and they are being carried out honestly and effectively. We are and will continue to operate a program to assure (1) maximum protection to the Government and (2) due regard for the rights of the individual.

2. Under this program, all departmental and Foreign Service officers receive complete security investigations. These investigations are exhaustive and are made by trained investigators, operating under the direct supervision of a former FBI agent, Mr. Donald Nicholson.

3. The Department does not permit any employee to have access to secret material when it has determined that such access might constitute a danger to the security of the United States. To do otherwise would be contrary to the established security principles of the Department.

4. Questions as to the loyalty of any employee of this Department or the Foreign Service result in an up-to-date and full-scale investigation of the individual employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The evaluation of this investigation is made by a competent Loyalty Security Board which operates under the chairmanship of Gen. Conrad E. Snow, an experienced and able lawyer of distinguished reputation and unquestioned integrity.

5. This Board is made up of men of such high qualifications and unquestioned loyalty that I doubt that even the most suspicious person could be able to challenge their credentials.

6. The work of the Board is reviewed administratively by my immediate office and by the Loyalty Review Board of the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Seth Richardson, a former Assistant Attorney General under ex-President Herbert Hoover, was formerly chairman of the Loyalty Review Board. He

was succeeded by the present chairman, ex-Republican Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Hiram Bingham.

7. In the more than 4 years of operation under this procedure, the Loyalty Review Board has never reversed the Department's adjudication of a case.

8. In conducting this program, the Department has uncovered some employees who did not meet its high security standards, and these employees have been separated.

As should be perfectly clear from the foregoing, the conduct of the Department's loyalty and security programs are predicated on thoroughly tried and proven American principles. We will continue to operate this program in the same straightforward manner in the future, confident that we are taking every reasonable step to assure a completely loyal and trustworthy group of employees. But we will not abandon adherence to those concepts so carefully and deliberately laid down in the President's loyalty program, and we will not compromise our legal and ethical responsibilities under pressure of political stratagem or threat.

Sincerely yours,

CARLISLE H. HUMELSINE.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I find an interesting passage on page 3 of the letter, which reads as follows:

In the more than 4 years of operation under this procedure, the Loyalty Review Board has never reversed the Department's adjudication of a case.

In other words, Mr. Acheson's man is telling how good their board is because it has never been reversed. In view of the fact that they have never found an individual unfit for service, there could never have been an appeal to the Loyalty Review Board. Therefore, since there was never an appeal, there could not have been a reversal.

However, the Review Board has the power to take up a case on post audit and indicate dissatisfaction with the case. That has been done time and time again. Even though the Secretary says this is not a reversal. As an example of such a case I invite the attention of the Senate to the case of Service. I informed the late unlamented Tydings committee that the Service case had been post-audited, sent back to the Loyalty Board, and that the Review Board said it was handled so badly that it wanted to call in an entirely new board and also asked that Service be brought back from a key spot in India. The State Department immediately issued a press release or called a press conference, I don't recall which, and announced that this was untrue; that McCARTHY was lying and that Service's case had not been ordered reopened. I called the Department and told them unless they would issue a true statement of the facts, I would make public the photostats of the Review Board's ruling. Within a half an hour the State Department mysteriously found that the Service case had been ordered reopened and so announced.

I merely mention it because it sheds light on how much credit we can give to the official statements from the State Department. It would seem officials of the Department, who are, like Members of the Senate, servants of the people, would have the decency and honesty to tell the American people the truth.

So much for that.

I should like to make it very clear as I refer to the loyalty board of the State Department that I am not referring to the Civil Service Commission's Loyalty Review Board. That Board, as we all know, was doing an extremely foul job until its head, Seth Richardson, was promoted, and his place was taken over by former Senator Bingham, of Connecticut. I think Senator Bingham is doing the best job anyone could do under the circumstances.

I hesitate praising Senator Bingham because I know any words of praise from me for any Government official certainly endanger's that person's job.

Mr. President, I very much dislike bringing in the names of these individuals, but I frankly do not think I have any other choice. I think, so long as they are being given access to secret material and have been officially charged, that they have no more right to have their names remain secret than would someone who might be charged with reckless driving, embezzlement, or with any other crime or misdemeanor.

I shall briefly run through the cases, Mr. President. The first case is that of an individual well known to all of us, John Carter Vincent. Please keep in mind that these "letters of charges" were not prepared by me; they were prepared as the result of investigations by the FBI or State Department investigators.

Vincent is charged with being a member of the Communist Party, and to the best of my knowledge he is also charged with espionage activities while in Switzerland.

I would suggest to the McCarran committee that if they can obtain the correspondence between the Central Intelligence Agency and Dean Acheson's office they will find the correspondence very revealing. I doubt if they will be able to get it, in view of what happened in the committee this morning. A very fantastic thing occurred before the McCarran committee this morning. General Willoughby was before the committee and was asked to give information on the communistic activities of certain Government employees, and he read into the record an order which he received from the Army saying to him, "General, you must not give the Senate committee any information about any employee of this Government."

Inconceivable? Yes. But it is true. It is part of the record.

So, Mr. President, I am not too hopeful that the McCarran committee will be able to get that correspondence.

One of the members of the Loyalty Board informs us that Acheson has assured them that the Department will not call Vincent back from Africa.

Some of the additional information is not contained in the letter of charges, which I commend to the attention of the McCarran committee. I refer to the activities of George Ottlik who has been working hand in glove with Vincent in Switzerland. Ottlik represented the short-lived Hungarian Communist regime of Bela Kun. He was stationed in Berne, Switzerland.

While he was Director of the Far Eastern Division in 1945 Vincent wrote a memorandum, which is in his State Department file, strongly urging that General Hodge establish a coalition government between North Korea and South Korea. He objected strenuously to Syngman Rhee and urged that the State Department assist a Moscow-trained Communist by the name of Kem Koosok to get the presidency of South Korea. As we also know, Vincent has been a very close associate of Owen Lattimore. Lattimore has been named by two witnesses as a Communist and as an agent of the Soviet Secret Police, respectively.

On page 172 of Wallace's book it is pointed out that in 1944 a high official of the Soviet Government proposed a toast to Owen Lattimore and John Carter Vincent.

He proposed a toast, which was quoted by Wallace as follows:

To Owen—

Here we have the top representative of the Soviet, and here is his toast, as quoted by Wallace—

To Owen Lattimore and John Carter Vincent, American experts on China on whom rests great responsibility for China's future.

That is to be found on page 177 of Wallace's book. So much for John Carter Vincent.

The next case is the case of William T. Stone. Stone's Communist activities are legion, and I will not attempt to describe all of them. It is of some interest to note that he was one of the co-editors of *Amerasia*. *Amerasia* has been described by the FBI as a "tool of Soviet espionage." He was also one of the high officers in the Institute of Pacific Relations.

Prior to the formation of the present Loyalty Board in the State Department there was a board—I believe it was referred to as the Security Board—and there were some good men on that board, but, of course, they are no longer in the Department. In 1946 that Board recommended as follows with regard to this man Stone:

In behalf of the above mentioned it is recommended that action be instituted to terminate his services with the State Department immediately.

The date of that, incidentally, was March 22, 1946. I continue to quote from the Security Board report:

It is suggested to achieve this purpose that an appropriate officer of the Department should inform Mr. Stone that his continued employment in the Department is embarrassing to the Department, and he should be given an opportunity to resign. If he should not resign voluntarily, action should be immediately instituted under Civil Service Rule No. 3 to terminate his services with the Department.

That was ignored by Acheson, who was then Undersecretary of State, and ignored by Stone's immediate superior, who was a man from Connecticut by the name of WILLIAM BENTON. Stone was working immediately under BENTON. As to some of Stone's additional activities—incidentally he formed a Washington branch of the Institute of Pa-

cific Relations together with Esther Brunauer, whose husband resigned from the Navy while his loyalty case was pending, and who has been suspended, I understand, from the State Department.

Stone was also involved in innumerable Communist-front activities. It perhaps should also be mentioned that William Stone was the man who succeeded in keeping George Shaw Wheeler on in an important position in the State Department. Wheeler had been ordered discharged from a key position in the State Department on the ground that he was an active and important member of the Communist Party. William T. Stone, however, intervened in Wheeler's behalf and succeeded in keeping him in his position. Stone labeled Wheeler as the ideal State Department employee. As the Senators will recall, Wheeler left the United States and went behind the iron curtain, at which time he issued a statement viciously condemning everything America stands for and applauding communism.

On August 4, 1948—this is a matter of interest which is not in the letter of charges, but I call it to the attention of the Senate—on August 4, 1948, Nathan Gregory Silvermaster, the exposed Communist spy, testified under oath that William T. Stone gave him naval-intelligence records. At that time, Stone was Assistant Director of the Board of Economic Warfare. Stone, of course, will be cleared by Acheson's loyalty board. There is no question about that.

Apparently the reason why one of my colleagues [Mr. BENTON] has been squealing so loudly about McCARTHY's attacks on Communists is that some of his friends, such as William T. Stone, are going to be exposed. Stone's name has already cropped up in the McCarran hearings. As I said, the immediate superior of Stone in the State Department was the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON].

The next case, Mr. President, is the case of Herbert Fierst. Herbert Fierst is a foreign-affairs specialist in the Department of State. A memorandum of August 2, 1946, by Mr. Bannerman, one of the security officers in the Department of State, is to the effect that physical surveillance showed that this man Fierst was in constant contact with members of an espionage group and that he recommended Communists for State Department employment, and was engaged in a number of other Communist activities.

Incidentally the Loyalty Review Board, which post-audited the Fierst case about 2½ years ago, after he had been cleared, and ordered it back to the State Department, said, "We are not satisfied with this. This man is obviously either a Communist or following the line. We cannot approve having a man handling top secret material who is chumming with espionage agents."

What do you think happened to the case? The State Department said, "The case is closed."

Another is Marcia Ruth Harrison, divisional assistant, Department of State. I will not read all the charges. One is that she belonged to a vast number of

Communist fronts, plus a Communist organization; that she belonged to the Young Communist League, was a paid-up member of it.

Next is Robert Ross, radio information specialist, Department of State.

Mr. President, I am not going to read the letters of charges in all these cases, but I will give a few typical cases.

The next is Ella M. Montague. She was born in Russia in 1896. She worked for the Amtorg Trading Corp. The testimony before three different committees is that only top members of the Communist Party could work for Amtorg. The Senate will recall that five or six of the officers of Amtorg were picked up about a year ago and charged with espionage. Under pressure from the State Department they were allowed to return to Russia.

Next is the case of Olga V. Osnatch. At the time of our original investigation she was not yet a citizen of the United States. She may have gotten her papers since, but I do not know. She worked for the Russian Embassy in Turkey for 3 years. Then with the Russian Welfare Society and so forth. One of the significant things here, of course, is that the Russians do not hire people in their embassies unless they are Communists.

Another is Stella Gordon, also known as Estella Gordon, correspondent and research clerk, Department of State. Incidentally, Mr. President, I know that after I have given these cases and the summary of the letter of charges against some, there will be the usual high-pitched screaming and squealing that McCARTHY has done this under senatorial immunity. I thought that charge should be laid to rest once and for all, so the other night before I went on a television broadcast I offered the sponsors to name these individuals. The sponsors' lawyers said "No, we do not want you to do that"—and I do not blame them. I think it was good legal advice which they gave because, as Louis Budenz and some of the other top former Communists have testified, up to 1945 the orders of the party to members were "Don't under any circumstances sue. We do not want to bring the party into prominence in that way."

In 1945, according to the sworn testimony of reputable witnesses like Budenz, the party line changed, and Communists have standing orders to sue in every case in which anyone was accused of Communist activity. They were told, "Sue, even though you have no chance of winning. If you can bring 5 or 10 or 15 suits against a man you can bleed him white while he is defending them, and take up all his time, and he can spend no time in the fight against communism."

A good example was William Remington. The Senate will recall that Remington was named on a radio broadcast—Meet the Press, I believe—as a member of the Communist Party. He promptly filed suit. The radio chain and the insurance company, of course, had no access to Remington's files. They could not prove that he was the Communist he was, so they paid him \$10,000. The Senate knows that since that time Remington has been convicted. He was indicted by a New York grand jury and

then convicted by a New York jury. The conviction was upheld by a court. It was a conviction based upon perjury, where he said that he was not a Communist. In other words, he was found to be a member of the Communist Party.

I mention that to show that I do not at all blame the sponsor for not wanting me to name these people on his program.

Some members of the press have been shouting that McCARTHY has been giving this information under immunity, so I notified the three press services that if they would have representatives at my office at 10 o'clock the next morning I would give them all the information about these individuals, and give them their names, if I could have some assurance that they wanted to print them, knowing, of course, that they would not, because all of us have had the experience of members of the press telling us that they cannot use certain information because it might subject their papers to suits for libel or slander. Again, I do not blame them, because if 10 or 15 or 20 Communists started libel and slander actions against the newspapers it would cost them a fortune, and they would be busy defending lawsuits.

The three press services said, "No; we will take the names, but we will give you no assurance that we will print them." I was assured by one of the men that he knew that under no circumstances would they print them unless I used the names on the floor of the Senate.

Some members of the press also asked if their newspapers could get the information. I said, "Yes; if your editor will simply tell me that he wants to use the names, he can have them." I received no calls from any editors.

That should, I hope, lay at rest once and for all the silly, asinine claim that a Senator can expose corruption or communism somewhere other than on the Senate floor or before a committee. If he went off the Senate floor and exposed it, no one would hear about it except those within the range of his voice. If we are to have a housecleaning, the people, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from New Orleans to St. Paul, should have the information about these dangerous characters.

The next one is Daniel F. Markolies, one of the top security men in the State Department. Originally the appointment of this man was disapproved on the ground that he was a bad loyalty and security risk. He was hired anyway.

The next name is that of Robert Warren Barnett. This is one of the men who was brought into the State Department on the recommendation of the Institute of Pacific Relations. Edward Carter testified to that the other day. He has been active in the institute for a number of years.

The letter of charges against the Barnetts—both Robert Warren Barnett and his wife, Mrs. Robert Warren Barnett—charges them with close association and constant contact with known Soviet espionage activity.

The next is Sylvia Schimmel, an administrative analyst in the Department of State. The letter of charges in her case is briefer, but substantially the same as that in the case of the Barnetts.

The next is Philip Raine, a regional specialist in the Department of State. He is tied up, in the letter of charges, very closely with Robert T. Miller, who has been identified under oath several times as a Russian espionage agent.

The next is Gertrude Cameron, information and editorial specialist in the Department of State. I recommend this case especially to the McCarran committee.

The next is Paul A. Lifantieff-Lee, an economist in the Department of State. He was born in Russia. His file in the Navy Department, which was transmitted to the State Department, shows that he took secret State Department documents, which were found in his room and picked up by naval intelligence. That is shown by the naval intelligence report.

The next name is Franz Leopold Neumann, a consultant in the Department of State.

The next is John Tipton Fishburn, labor economist in the Department of State.

The next is Victor Myron Hunt, in the Office of Educational Exchange, Department of State.

The next is Arpad Erdos. He is an information specialist in the Department of State. For some time this man was with the Voice of America, but he was promoted, and now has a higher-paid job.

The next is an editor-writer by the name of Frances M. Tuchscher.

The next is Nelson Chipchin, a radio information specialist. This is another case that I recommend especially to the McCarran committee.

The next is Esther Less, also known as Esther Less Kopelewich, an announcer in the Department of State.

The next is Esther Caukin Brunauer, United States representative to the Preparatory Commission of UNESCO, Department of State.

The next is John Patton Davies. Incidentally, since I wrote the State Department, Davies has been cleared, despite the vast amount of information on his communistic activities. I understand he is being promoted and sent to Berlin to act as adviser to McCloy.

One final phase, the prize of them all, against whom charges are now pending, is Philip C. Jessup. The history of this man Jessup is so unusual that I assume some day we shall look back and say: "No; it is impossible. The State Department certainly would not have given this man the top job that he had over in Paris, negotiating with the Russians even as Hiss in a less important capacity did the negotiating at Yalta."

I am not going to take much of the Senate's time on this case. I wish briefly to go through some of the material I have in my hand. Testimony was given by Jessup on two different occasions, the occasion of the first trial of Alger Hiss, and the second trial.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I notice on the list read by the Senator the name of Esther Caukin Brunauer. It seems to me that I recall reading in the newspaper that she had been removed, along with her husband, from Government employment. Am I correct in my recollection?

Mr. McCARTHY. I understand that two of the individuals were suspended. They are Brunauer and Val R. Lorwin, the economist in the State Department. The information is to the effect that they are still on the payroll of the State Department, pending inquiry. Mrs. Brunauer's husband, Stephen Brunauer, was employed in the Navy Department as head of the High Explosives Section. He was named before the Tydings committee last year. The Senator will remember that I asked the Tydings committee to go into executive session and take up his case. They refused to do so. They said, "No; Brunauer has been cleared by the Loyalty Board, and we will not let you smear him."

Former Secretary Matthews did a pretty good job in the case. He took all the evidence against Brunauer and suspended Brunauer. Brunauer would not wait until his case had been decided, but resigned.

I may say, Mr. President, that Brunauer was a very close friend of Noel Field, who, since the Tydings hearing of last year, has disappeared behind the iron curtain. How many of our secrets he has taken with him behind the iron curtain, I do not know. I am giving to the Senate a list of 26 names. Of the 26, I understand, two have been suspended, but the State Department will neither admit nor deny it. My letter of June 23 gave the State Department a list of 29 names. Of the 29, 2 have resigned, and they are no longer with the State Department. The third individual, who holds an important position in the point 4 program, has been cleared. Today I am not giving the names of any of the individuals who have been cleared. Twenty-eight of the one hundred and five have been cleared. I am not giving their names to the Senate, but instead am giving them to the McCarran committee.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Were those cases passed upon by the new Loyalty Board under former Senator Bingham?

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no. I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that if the cases of the individuals involved had been before the Bingham Board, and if former Senator Bingham had the power to deny them access to secret material, I would not have to get up on the floor of the Senate to give this information. If the case were before the Bingham Board it would certainly not be necessary to give this information.

Senator Bingham's Board has no jurisdiction whatever over these cases until the State Department finds a man unfit for service. In that case the individual involved can appeal to the Bingham Board. If they do not find him unfit for Government service, his case does not come before the Bingham Board. After the State Department clears an individual the Bingham Board can, however, pick up that case on what is called a post-audit and send it back to the State Department, saying, "We want this case reheard." If the State Department again clears the individual the Bingham Board, I understand, takes the position—which is the opposite from the position taken by the Richardson Board—that it can take up the case again and order the man removed if that Board finds him unfit. Whether he has the power to do so under the law, I am not certain. However, I am glad to hear that he is adopting that position. None of the cases covered today have been cleared by the Bingham Board.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Former Senator Bingham has publicly announced, however, that he has reversed the policy of the Richardson Board, which Board said that when there was any doubt as to whether or not a man was actually a Communist spy or a good American, and they could not resolve the evidence definitely one way or another, that it was their policy to give the benefit of the doubt to the individual, and let him continue to hold his security position. Former Senator Bingham announced immediately when he took over the post that in his opinion such procedure was an utterly indefensible attitude to take, either in a time of war or in a time like this, and he announced that if his board was unable to resolve definitely the question of whether or not a man was actually a Communist spy working for the Government, or a good citizen, and there was no conclusive proof either way, his board would give the benefit of the doubt to the Government and to the 130,000,000 good patriotic Americans, whose interest and future is jeopardized when Communist spies are permitted to remain in the Government service. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. I believe the Senator from South Dakota has stated the situation very correctly. The Richardson Board apparently took the opposite position. They took the position that unless they could find a man had committed an overt act of disloyalty, they would not recommend his discharge.

Mr. MUNDT. Unless they could find a Communist membership card in his pocket with a stamp on it showing that the dues had been paid currently, they would not consider him a security risk?

Mr. McCARTHY. Not even then, I will say to the Senator from South Dakota. They would not consider that an overt act. For example, Remington was proven to have been a member of the Communist Party. Seth Richardson took the position that in view of the

fact that it could not be proved that Remington was a member of the Communist Party as of the moment the Board was holding its hearings, they could not discharge him.

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, he was behind in his dues.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is never possible to prove a man is a Communist at any one particular moment. He can always say that he quit the party yesterday or the day before. I may say that the Board under Richardson met on April 20, 1950. President Truman had sent to the Board the list of names that I had given to the Tydings committee. The Richardson board met in secret session. I shall be glad to show the Senator from South Dakota a copy of the discussion by the Board in its secret hearing. It will show why so many unusual characters are still employed in the State Department. The discussion runs over approximately 20 pages. At first they argued whether or not they could make a finding against any of the individuals if they found he was a bad security risk, or whether they had to find that he had committed an overt act of disloyalty. Then there were some arguments as to what an overt act was. They contacted President Truman and they contacted either the Secretary of State or the Attorney General. I do not recall which one it was. In any event they asked for advice, and they were advised that they were not to check into the past of any man's character dealing with the point of whether or not a man was a bad security risk.

The Senator will be surprised to find that while some Members argued that the information should be put in the file, they finally decided against doing it on the ground that if they checked on a man as to whether or not he was a bad security risk and put that information in the file, McCARTHY or someone else might find out that they had labeled a man a bad security risk and would bring the fact to the attention of the Senate. Therefore they decided not to make such a check. Happily the new chairman of the Board, former Senator Bingham, has to a great extent reversed that procedure, although he is working under a tremendous handicap in that department.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator for the explanation. I merely wished to point out that fact, so that the country could have confidence in the new Board, and know that the Board had completely reversed the Richardson philosophy. In other words, it is no longer necessary to catch a man with a bomb in his hand or with a Communist membership card in his pocket. The new Board feels that whenever there is a reasonable doubt about a man's character, and it is unable to determine whether he is a loyal American or a Communist spy, and they cannot make a positive affirmation one way or another, the new Board gives the benefit of the doubt to the Government and to the 130,000,000 Americans, whose life and future are entirely in the hands of any disloyal elements that may get into important strategic positions of the Government, whether it be in Defense,

State, or any other key spot in Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think one of the cases demonstrates very well what the Senator is talking about, namely, the case of John S. Service. That case also shows the weakness of the Loyalty Board structure and its proceedings. The Service case is presently being held before the State Department's Loyalty Board, and apparently will be held there indefinitely. Some of the members of the Review Board are concerned about that, because they do not have jurisdiction until the State Department and its Loyalty Board have made their decision. The State Department thus can hold up a case for 2 or 3 years, and while it is pending, the Review Board has no power to make a post-audit or anything else of it.

To recall some of the facts in the Service case, the Senator from South Dakota will remember that representatives of the FBI testified under oath before the Tydings subcommittee that when Service was in this country, they followed him from the State Department, which he left with large brown envelopes under his arm, to the hotel room of Philip Jaffe, who long has been known as a Communist, and was named as a Communist spy, and later was convicted. The representatives of the FBI said they trailed Service to Jaffe's hotel room; and trailed him away without those envelopes. They testified that they put microphones in Jaffe's room, and over those microphones they heard conversations going on in that room, and over the microphones they heard Service discuss top-secret military information with that Communist spy—information which he was giving that Communist spy. The Senator understands that I am now referring to testimony by representatives of the FBI.

As we recall, the Tydings subcommittee met and said, in effect, "Isn't it awful, the way McCARTHY smeared this poor Mr. Service?" The State Department's Loyalty Board met and said that Service was an ideal public servant.

However, his case has been reopened, and I am rather interested in seeing what happens when that case goes before Senator Bingham's board.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me that the case of William K. Remington is an even more startling illustration of how utterly futile and ineffective the Richardson Board was.

The junior Senator from Michigan has just entered the Chamber, let me say. I recall attending hearings when the Remington case was brought into the picture. I know that when I was a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, we ventilated the Remington case. By that time the Loyalty Board was in operation, and it had authority to make examinations. It sat and held sessions. Despite the fact that Remington has since then been removed from office and convicted, and I suppose is now in a Federal penitentiary, where he should be, to this late hour the Loyalty Board has never found Remington to be a loyalty risk; and according to the records of the Loyalty Board, Remington

is a good and faithful public servant. So, obviously, that kind of Loyalty Board is worse than nothing, because it gives a false sense of security to the people, and makes them think that the traitors and the treasonable characters will be weeded out of the Government service.

Mr. McCARTHY. Also I should like to say that the Remington case was one of the cases I called to the attention of the Tydings subcommittee, and I pointed out that although technically Remington was not on the State Department's payroll, but was on the payroll of the Department of Commerce—

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; Remington had, interestingly enough, the strategic job of determining what kind of military exports would be sent to Russia.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct. Of course, as the Senator from South Dakota recalls, Secretary Sawyer ordered Remington discharged. However, Remington appealed to the Richardson Board, and that board ordered him reinstated. While Remington was serving in the Department of Commerce, that Department did a good job of keeping him away from strategic information. However, later he very cleverly got into the State Department and got hold of such information in that way.

Elizabeth Bentley testified before the committee that Remington was one of the couriers for her and for other Communist spies. However, the Tydings subcommittee refused to consider her testimony seriously, and the Loyalty Board found Remington to be a good American.

Incidentally, I may say that next week there will be issued a report which will damn McCARTHY from hell to breakfast for going into Maryland and telling the Maryland voters about the tremendous whitewash job Senator Tydings did. Of course, Mr. President, if Senator Tydings did not do a whitewash job, then I treated him very unfairly, and then I should not have helped to let the people know what a whitewash job he did do. On the other hand, if Tydings did a whitewash job and if I did not expose that to the people of Maryland, I would be almost as guilty as Tydings.

Of course one spy in the Government service is too many. In a case of this sort, when the chairman of the committee is told, "Here is a man who is a Communist spy, and here are the witnesses. Please call them," then when the chairman of the committee says, "Oh, no; I won't," it is rather difficult for me to understand why my friends criticize me for exposing Mr. Tydings. In fact, I understand that one Senator would like to see the Senator from Wisconsin expelled from the Senate because he exposed our friend, Millard Tydings.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In fairness to the other members of the committee, inasmuch as the Senator from Wisconsin has mentioned one of them who would like to see the Senator from Wisconsin

removed, I think it is proper and in order for the Senator from Wisconsin to mention the Senator in question.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] submitted the resolution. I certainly was not referring to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON].

Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from South Dakota to the secret workings and secret minutes of the Loyalty Board, under Seth Richardson, which met in April 1950. The Senator will see in the minutes that present at that time were George W. Alger, John H. Amen, Harry W. Blair, John Kirkland Clark, Clem W. Collins, Meta Glass, Paul M. Herbert, Garrett S. Hoag, Wilbur LaRoe, Jr., Brunson MacChesney, Arthur W. Macmahon, Henry L. Shattuck, Andrew Steers, Eliot Wadsworth, Leonard D. White, and Chairman Richardson was presiding. In fairness to those who were present, I should say that some of them, as the Senator from South Dakota will note, made a strong argument to the effect that they should investigate those individuals completely and thoroughly, regardless of whether the matters involved dealt with loyalty, security, or anything else which would make such persons unfit to serve. The Senator will also note that they then contacted the President and asked him whether they should make the examination, and received word to the effect that they should not, but should check only on overt acts of disloyalty—which resulted in clearance of every one of those persons, because they could not find them lighting a fuse to an H-bomb.

Mr. President, I believe I have covered all the cases now, except one, namely, the case of Philip C. Jessup.

First, let me say that if the Senator from South Dakota would care to see what has happened to a number of the other individuals whom I named last year, I shall be glad to let him examine the information which has come from the Review Board. I wish he would not give the names of any of the persons who have been cleared, however.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand the testimony of Jessup in the Hiss case. Jessup was unable to be present at the trial; he was out of the country. Accordingly, he made out affidavits.

It is not too difficult to understand how someone might have testified in favor of Hiss at the first trial. However, after all the evidence was brought to the attention of the public, so that men high in the Government service certainly knew that Hiss was a Communist spy, it is rather difficult then to understand how they would come to the defense of Hiss.

Here is the testimony of Jessup during Hiss' second trial:

Question. Mr. Jessup, do you know the reputation of Alger Hiss for loyalty, integrity, and veracity?

Answer. Yes; I do.

Question. What is that reputation? What do you think of it?

Answer. Outstanding.

That is only a minor part of his record. The head of the FBI, during his testimony before one of the committees, was asked whether it was significant that

an individual belonged to a Communist-front organization. He pointed out that it might or might not be. He pointed out that many fine individuals were duped into joining Communist-front organizations. Of course, that was the aim of the Communist Party, to try to get some good, loyal Americans on their lists, so they could use them to deceive people. But, as he said, "If you find that a man belongs to four, five, or six of these organizations that have been named as fronts doing the work of the Communist Party, they are either so naive that they are dangerous to this Nation in a high Government job, or you can be sure that they are loyal to the Communist Party." That is not a verbatim quote, but as best I can remember it.

One of the other men who was testifying was asked the same question, and he said this: "Well, let us put it this way. If you find that a man belongs to the Lutheran Young Men's Society, you can assume that he is most likely loyal to the principles of the Lutheran Church. If you find that he belongs to the Holy Name Society, you can assume that perhaps he is a Catholic; and," he said, "if you find that he belongs to organizations which are fronts for the Communist Party, then you can assume that he is either a Communist or that he certainly is loyal to the Communist Party."

Mr. Jessup, our Ambassador at Large, was affiliated with not one, not two, not three, not four, but with five organizations officially named as fronts for and doing the work of the Communist Party. Here are photostats of official letterheads which show his affiliations.

That is not all. Mr. Jessup exercised editorial control of the publication "Far East Survey," a publication of the Institute of Pacific Relations, which has been named by a legislative committee as a Communist front. While he had that editorial control, and while that publication was following the Communist line down to the last period, who do you think was supporting it? When Frederick Field, a man who proclaims himself to be one of America's leading Communists was on the stand last year, he was asked whether he had contributed to Jessup's publication. His answer was, "I refuse to answer, on the ground that it might incriminate me." With some difficulty, we dug up the checks covering Communist money—believe it or not—over a short period of time, totaling \$6,000, used for the purpose of supporting the Communist-front publication run by our Ambassador at Large, a publication which, according to sworn testimony, employed many Communist writers. When this evidence was brought to the attention of the Tydings committee, the State Department had to have a press conference, which it did, at which they said, "Now, here is another example of this nasty McCarthyism." They said, "Just because poor Mr. Jessup took some Communist money, McCARTHY is trying to indicate that that is why he followed the Communist line in his publication"—their theory being, apparently, that Mr. Jessup was so naive that he did not know why the Communists were paying him and were supporting that publication. We

can be certain that if Mr. Jessup was that naive, the Communists were not so naive. They knew they were getting a dollar's worth, and more, for every dollar they spent. The committee refused to go into the matter, but when I, with my limited staff, could dig up checks totaling \$6,000, representing Communist money, we can be very certain that there were many more thousands of dollars which Jessup received.

Let us keep in mind, as we read the photostat I have in my hand now, that we are talking about the man who represented the United States in the Big Four Conference in Paris, in the fight, if you please, against communism, and if it is possible to find a better analogy than Hiss at Yalta, I do not know where it would be. I have in my hand a photostat of a petition which appeared in the New York Times on February 13, 1946. The Senate will recall that, at that time, the Communist Party line was that, if only the United States would destroy all its atomic bombs, if we would tear down our atomic facilities, we would then convince Russia that we were peace-loving and the result would be that there would be no danger of war. That was, of course, while Russia was obtaining our secrets and frantically trying to build her own atomic bombs. It was not too surprising to find the Daily Worker saying that—but one would hardly expect that our Ambassador at Large would say it. But I have in my hand this petition, signed by Jessup, which was published in the New York Times on February 13, 1946. Let me refer to two lines, in which this petition asks "that the United States at once stop the production of atomic bombs and atomic material, and that all the material which has been produced be destroyed by appropriate means, such as dumping it into the ocean." That is Philip Jessup. Some interesting information has been developed before the Tydings committee, of course, about Jessup. For example, they produced a letter at the hearing, which the Senate may or may not have seen. A letter which Jessup wrote to Vincent, talking about Frederick Field, the top Communist saying, "We have got to help Freddie all we can"—that was when he was about to head a Communist organization—"I suggest a press release as follows." Then Jessup wrote the press release and sent it to Field, a press release which was identical, almost to the last comma, with the Daily Worker's description of this Communist front.

Last year, when we were trying to dig some of the Communists out of Government, the President made a speech. As I recall, it was made over a Nationwide hook-up. In it he said it was a great mistake to do what I was doing, that we were endangering national unity. He said, "Now, if McCARTHY or anyone else has any information about Communists or anyone who is bad for this country, let him send the information to me, Harry S. Truman." He said, "I will take action. You should not do it the way McCARTHY is doing it."

Mr. President, when we got this material regarding Jessup, I decided I would call the President's bluff, so we

sent all of it to him. We sent him copies of the magazine which Jessup was publishing, which contained articles which followed the Communist line right down to the last period. One would think it was the Cominform's official program, and rightly so, because the articles were being written by men who have been identified under oath as Communists. We sent him photostats of the checks, showing that the Communists were supporting Jessup's publication. We sent him a copy of the petition of Jessup, saying "Let us destroy our atomic bomb." We sent him copies of Jessup's testimony praising Alger Hiss. We sent him photostats showing that Mr. Jessup was affiliated with five organizations which had been officially named as fronts for and doing the work for the Communist Party.

I said, "Now, Mr. President, take action. Here is some evidence. Certainly you cannot say this man is good for America. He has been found at every time and place where disaster has struck America and success has come to Soviet Russia."

The President took action. What do Senators think the President's action was? It consisted of giving Philip C. Jessup top secret clearance to all atomic and hydrogen-bomb information. Of all the stupidly stubborn and stubbornly stupid examples of playing with the lives of American boys, I think that tops them all.

Mr. President, in closing, let me say, again, that I very much dislike having to name these individuals who are under charges of Communist activities. I begged the Secretary of State to deny them access to secret material, and told him if he did not do so I would have to name them. He refused. Some of them may be able to prove that they are neither security nor loyalty risks. If so, they have been hurt by this publicity, and I regret it. But if an individual is accused of reckless driving, jumping a stop sign, or embezzling from a bank, the American people get that information. So why should not the American people be informed when their servants are accused of Communist activities as a result of FBI investigations.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I regret that I find it necessary to address the Senate of the United States this afternoon. It is regrettable because the majority leader should not have to make any remarks dealing with the responsibility of a Member of this great body; it is regrettable that any Member must be reminded of the tradition of service in this body which requires the highest degree of integrity in the performance of his duty.

Mr. President, for over a century and a half the Senate has been known as a body of integrity, of honor, and of dignity. It was because of what we read when we were in school about those who preceded us that some of us had the inspiration to make membership in the United States Senate our goal; we felt it would be a distinguished honor to serve in this body.

To be a Member of the United States Senate imposes on one certain respon-

sibilities to his fellow men, to his Government, and to his Nation. If any Senator has evidence that any man has committed a high crime, or if he has evidence that any man serving in the Government is disloyal, he has the solemn duty to place that evidence before a proper tribunal. If a court of justice does not act, he has of course the responsibility of placing the evidence before his colleagues. Mr. President, our forefathers, when they wrote the Constitution of the United States, granted us certain immunity on the floor of the Senate. Why? Because it was their opinion that the Members of this body could always be relied upon never to charge any individual unfairly or unjustly, never tear down his character, or hurt his good name unless compelling evidence against him was in their possession.

Mr. President, just as it is the duty of a Member of the Senate to lay before the proper tribunal or to lay before a court or before this body evidence, he has a like responsibility never to say one word against the good name of an individual unless he has the evidence to support the charge. If he has such evidence, it is his duty to lay it before the Senate at the time he makes the charge against the individual.

When I was a small boy my mother taught me that when one takes from an individual his good name, that individual has been stripped of his most valuable possession.

I have sat on the floor of the Senate and heard men charged, by innuendo and inference, with disloyalty, and even with high crimes and misdemeanors, without any substantial evidence of the charge being laid before the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I have sat on this floor and heard one Senator, by innuendo and insinuation, charge a high official of this Government, a man who had served his country for a lifetime with distinction and honor, with being a traitor or a near traitor. Tragically there seems to be no easy way to cope with a situation like that, since to attempt to refute such charges merely dignifies the assertion. There is only one way to meet that kind of conduct and it is to remind Members of their duty and responsibility.

The distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] is on the floor. I want to congratulate her on a statement which she made in the Senate on June 18, 1951, a statement we all may take to heart. I should like to read the last two paragraphs of her remarks:

As an American I am shocked at the way Republicans and Democrats alike are playing directly into the Communist design of confuse, divide, and conquer.

As an American I do not want a Democratic administration whitewash or cover up any more than I want a Republican smear or witch hunt.

As an American I condemn a Republican-Fascist just as much as I condemn a Democrat-Communist. I condemn a Democrat-Fascist just as much as I condemn a Republican-Communist. They are equally dangerous to you and me and to our country. As an American I want to see our Nation recapture the strength and unity it once had when we fought the enemy instead of ourselves.

Mr. President, I emphasize that when a man's good name is taken away by insinuations and innuendoes he has been done a great injustice. I desire to add, Mr. President—

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. No; I do not yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not think the Senator would. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. McFARLAND. I desire to emphasize, Mr. President, that when one is unjustly accused of disloyalty to his country an equally great injustice is being done our country and our free institutions. Ah, Mr. President, our enemy, the Kremlin, would like very much to have those charged with responsibility for our Government unjustly brought under suspicion and distrust, to have us distrust each other and fight among ourselves and accuse each other. When we do that we serve their purpose just as effectively as one of their paid agents.

Mr. President, it is beneath the dignity of Members of the Senate to smear any individual. It behooves us to have valid and substantial evidence when an individual is mentioned by us as being disloyal to his country. No Senator should become a character assassin.

I suggest, Mr. President, that when the name of any Member of the Senate becomes an adjective for mud slinging, we have come a far way from the tradition of those great men who preceded us here; we have torn down the dignity and standing and respect that this body should enjoy; we have come to a time when a halt must be called.

I hope we may reexamine the speech of the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and that we will abide by the principles which that distinguished Senator enunciated.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARTHY rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). The Chair recognizes the Senator from New York.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. LEHMAN. Once more the Senate is hearing—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Does not the present occupant of the chair feel that inasmuch as the majority leader has made a speech of the kind we have just heard, in all fairness the Senator from Wisconsin should be recognized to respond to the speech? He was on his feet, and I think he is entitled to recognition at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize him. The Chair understands that the Senator from New York will be through in a moment. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Wisconsin. The Chair did not see the Senator from Wisconsin rise.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair. I hope the majority leader will remain on the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I did not catch the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair ruled that the Senator from New York has the floor. He is the Senator the Chair first recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Once more the Senate is hearing the names of several persons mentioned and the irresponsible charge made that they are disloyal to the United States or even traitors to their country.

I do not know anything about many of the individuals who have been named here today. I do know that the process of making charges in public against the loyalty of certain persons under the protection of congressional immunity is a form of character assassination which all of us must abhor and condemn. I shall have more to say on this subject, as we all should, at a later date.

One of the names bandied about today is that of Philip C. Jessup, Ambassador at Large, and one of the most distinguished public servants in our Government. One of the most skillful and effective spokesmen of the United States in international affairs, Philip Jessup, whom I know well, has ably served his country during the past few years in exposing, in the forums of the United Nations, the devious purposes and hypocrisy of the Soviet leaders.

He deserves much better of his fellow citizens than the shabby and dastardly treatment which is accorded him here today.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senator from New York is out of order.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I withdraw the word "dastardly" and I substitute—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the rule be enforced.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I withdraw the word "dastardly" and I substitute therefor the word "cowardly."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that the Senator from New York is out of order, and I ask that the rule be enforced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York, under the rule, will take his seat.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from New York be permitted to proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it is not.

Mr. WHERRY. That is all right. I will vote to permit the Senator to proceed in order if he will do so in order. If the Senator from New York is not acquainted with rule XIX I will tell him what it provides. It does not make any difference what the Senator thinks of the Senator from Wisconsin; under rule XIX he cannot in any way, directly or indirectly, impute improper motives to him.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have a right to speak.

Mr. McFARLAND. The motion is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable as the Chair understands.

As the Chair understood, the Senator from New York did not refer by name specifically to any Senator. Apparently the Chair did not hear clearly what the Senator from New York said.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, inasmuch as the distinguished occupant of the chair has made mention of what he heard—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that I may be given 5 minutes to answer the statement made by the distinguished Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. I call for the regular order.

Mr. WHERRY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has called for the regular order. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senator from New York proceed in order. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" have it, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish only on this occasion to offer for insertion into the RECORD at this point statements by three of the greatest Americans of our day. These statements say more than I can about the character and patriotism of Philip Jessup. These statements are not new, but neither are the charges that have been made here. The men whose testimony I now call upon to bear witness to the character of Mr. Philip Jessup, a citizen of the State of New York, are Gen. George C. Marshall, one of the noblest men who have ever lived, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, to whom we owe an unpayable debt of gratitude, and the late venerated Henry L. Stimson, respected by every American citizen. The statements by Generals Marshall and Eisenhower are in the form of letters addressed to Ambassador Jessup. The statement by the late Secretary Henry L. Stimson is in the form of a letter to the editor of the New York Times.

I wish merely to quote the last paragraph of the letter. He writes:

This is no time to let the noisy antics of a few upset the steady purpose of our country or distract our leaders from their proper tasks. This is rather a time for stern rebuke of such antics and outspoken support of the distinguished public servants against whom they are directed.

Mr. President, I not only fully agree with the words of that great statesman, that great Secretary of War and Secretary of State, Henry L. Stimson, but I go further and say that the time is long overdue when we should have rebuked the authors of antics reflecting on men, without supporting the charges with any real evidence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters to which I have referred be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 17, 1950.

MY DEAR JESSUP: I am shocked and distressed by the attack on your integrity as a public servant.

Throughout your intimate service with me while I was Secretary of State you were clearly outstanding as a representative of the Government both as to your masterful presentations and the firmness of your opposition to all Soviet or Communist attacks or pressures. This was conspicuously the case during your handling of the Security Council on the Berlin blockade issue.

Both the Under Secretary, Mr. Lovett, and I counted you as a great source of strength to the State Department during those critical days.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

MARCH 18, 1950.

MY DEAR JESSUP: I am writing to tell you how much your university deprecates the association of your name with the current loyalty investigation in the United States Senate.

Your long and distinguished record as a scholar and a public servant has won for you the respect of your colleagues and of the American people as well. No one who has known you can for a moment question the depth or sincerity of your devotion to the principles of Americanism. Your university associates and I are confident that any impression to the contrary will be quickly dispelled as the facts become known.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

LOYALTY IN WASHINGTON—METHODS AND MOTIVES OF ATTACK ON STATE DEPARTMENT QUESTIONED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The present charges against the Department of State have not in my view deserved much attention. But the very widespread notice they have received prompts me to make certain comments.

First, this is most emphatically not the proper way in which to insure loyalty of Government employees. If that had been the real purpose of the accuser, he would have used the fully developed and tested procedure of the executive branch of the Government, under which charges are investigated and weighed by men of both parties and unimpeachable integrity. Any constructive result which may eventuate from the present charges would have been achieved far more surely and effectively by use of the existing procedures. The fact that the accuser has wholly ignored this well-established method indicates that his interest is of a different character.

Second, no matter what else may occur, the present charges have already spattered mud upon individuals of the highest integrity, and in the present state of the world the denial cannot always overtake the accusation. It should by now be wholly clear that indiscriminate accusations of this sort are doubly offensive; they damage the innocent, and they help protect the guilty. For if the accuser is so stupid as to connect a man like Ambassador Jessup with communism, are not all such accusations made suspect?

REACTION ABROAD

Third, and more important by far, the method of the present charges directly and dangerously impedes the conduct of the foreign affairs of our Government. It creates abroad a feeling that we are frightened and suspicious of each other; it diverts our attention, at home, from the genuine and pressing problems of our foreign affairs; it requires of many high officials that they desert their proper duties in order to prepare and deliver such extensive replies as that of Mr. Jessup. Not one of these effects would have resulted from a disinterested study of the loyalty of any suspected State Department employees; each of them is the direct result of the manner in which these charges have been made.

Fourth, it seems to me quite clear that the real motive of the accuser in this case is to cast discredit upon the Secretary of State of the United States. This man is not trying to get rid of known Communists in the State Department; he is hoping against hope that he will find some. Fortunately, the Secretary of State needs no defense from me. No one who knows his extraordinary record of able and disinterested public service can believe that he is in any danger from these little men. It is already obvious that in any test of personal confidence the men of honor, in both parties, will choose to stand with the Secretary.

But there is more at stake in this matter than the rise or fall of individuals. What is at stake is the effective conduct of our foreign policy.

RESPONSIBILITY OF OFFICE

Every Secretary of State, second only to his President, and alone among appointive officers of the Government, stands before the world as the representative of the United States of America. No man who holds this office can fail to feel the extraordinary responsibility he carries for service to the country and its peace. No man has a greater right to ask the sympathetic support and the cooperation of his fellow citizens, and none is more properly exempt from the ordinary trials of politics. The man who seeks to gain political advantage from personal attack on a Secretary of State is a man who seeks political advantage from damage to his country.

The American Government, led by the President and the Secretary of State, is currently engaged in a major effort to give leadership to the country in a time of changing international conditions and grave world tension. This effort will require as part of our democratic process widespread and earnest public consideration of the great problems now before us, so that the ultimate decision will surely reflect the basic steadiness and faith of our people. In such public consideration there is always room for honest differences, but now, as for many years past, the formation of foreign policy most urgently demands an adjournment of mere partisanship.

This is no time to let the noisy antics of a few upset the steady purpose of our country or distract our leaders from their proper tasks. This is rather a time for stern rebuke of such antics and outspoken support of the distinguished public servants against whom they are directed.

HENRY L. STIMSON.

HUNTINGTON, LONG ISLAND, March 24, 1950.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a resolution adopted by the Utica post of the American Legion, of Utica, N. Y., in tribute to Mr. Philip C. Jessup, and in his defense against the unfounded charges which have been leveled against him. This resolution pays tribute to the man who is a past commander of that post, the same Philip C. Jessup.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION CONDEMNING ATTACK UPON PAST COMMANDER PHILIP C. JESSUP ADOPTED AT A REGULAR MEETING OF UTICA POST, NO. 229, AMERICAN LEGION, HELD ON APRIL 6, 1950

Whereas, Utica Post, No. 229, American Legion, is proud to number among the list of its past commanders a distinguished comrade, friend, and charter member, Ambassador Philip C. Jessup, whose record of patriotic devotion and continued helpfulness to our country over a period of many years

is a source of great satisfaction, pride, and distinction to Utica post and to its entire membership; and

Whereas the sterling character, splendid reputation, and unquestionable loyalty and patriotism of Past Commander Philip C. Jessup, both privately and in his public capacity as United States Ambassador at Large, have recently been subjected to scurrilous, unprincipled, and wholly unjustifiable attack by one JOSEPH McCARTHY, who in so doing has sullied the office of United States Senator which he presently holds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Utica Post, No. 229, American Legion, and its entire membership shall and do strongly resent, condemn, and decry the unprincipled, unjustified, unsportsmanlike, un-American, and intolerable conduct of Senator JOSEPH McCARTHY in his wanton attempt without proof or reason to smear and destroy the good reputation and high standing of so devoted and patriotic a citizen as our esteemed and valued friend and comrade, the Honorable Philip C. Jessup, United States Ambassador at Large; and be it further

Resolved, That Utica Post, No. 229, American Legion, and its members in meeting duly assembled feel privileged at this time to reaffirm their continued trust and confidence in, their esteem and devotion to, and their lasting friendship for a distinguished public servant, a loyal patriot, and a great citizen, the Honorable Philip C. Jessup, a past commander of this post; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be inscribed upon the minutes of this meeting, that a copy thereof be delivered to our comrade, Ambassador Jessup; that a second copy be delivered to the public press; and that a third copy be mailed to Senator McCARTHY with the admonition that his reckless and despicable conduct in this instance cannot be condoned by any right-thinking American and should never be repeated if he hopes to retain a shred of public respect.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Philip Jessup is a great American who has served, and is serving, his country with unsurpassed devotion, unselfishness, and loyalty. By character, by patriotism, by ability, and by useful service he belongs in the galaxy of those other outstanding American statesmen—Cordell Hull, Warren Austin, George C. Marshall, Henry L. Stimson, Averell Harriman, and John G. Winant.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am very sorry that the majority leader surrendered the floor before I could ask him any questions.

This is a very serious matter. The majority leader has a very important position. I am sure that he does not want to do what so many in his party have been doing—that is, labeling a once great party as a party which stands for the protection of Communists and crooks in Government.

I ask unanimous consent that, without losing the floor, I may direct some questions to the majority leader. I think perhaps we can use his advice in this—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARTHY. I am sure that the majority leader is not afraid to answer questions.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not going to be goaded into a colloquy with the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I have been discussing a principle of conduct for gentlemen. I did not mention any Sen-

ator by name in my remarks. Evidently the Senator from Wisconsin must have taken the facts as stated by me to fit him or he would not have replied.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I am rather surprised at the majority leader. In view of the fact that he is the leader of the Democratic Party, I should like to ask him now if he thinks it was terribly unfair to have "smeared" Mr. Remington last year. Last year I rose on the floor of the Senate and cited the case of William Remington. We offered the witnesses in that case. The Tydings committee said, "No; we will not hear them. He has been cleared by the Loyalty Board. Let us leave Mr. Remington in a position of importance." Thank God we had a good grand jury in New York. They considered the evidence against Remington and indicted him. Thank God there was a good jury and a good judge to try him. They found that man guilty.

From what the majority leader says today, apparently he feels that it was very unfair to name Remington. Some of the other individuals whom we are naming will also be convicted, even as Remington was.

I should like to ask the majority leader another question. The question is, What would he do if he saw the "letters of charges" against these individuals, charging them with Communist activities, one of them being charged with being an espionage agent? What would he do if he knew they had access to top-secret material? What would he do if he had Naval Intelligence reports showing that certain individuals are stealing secret documents? But the majority leader refuses to make answer.

We wrote to the Secretary of State and said, "Mr. Secretary, the least you can do, if you are interested in this country, is to deny those people access to secret material while they are under charges." He wrote back and said, "No; we will not do that."

I am surprised to think that the majority leader feels that it is unfair of me to try to force the Secretary of State to do what any loyal American would do. I suggest that the majority leader, together with members of his party who did considerable crying about the smearing of Owen Lattimore, go over and listen to the testimony given before the McCarran committee.

I suggest also that my friends on the other side of the aisle who are doing everything possible to label their party as a party of Communists and crooks, go over and see some good Democrats sitting on the McCarran committee, men who are Americans first and Democrats second.

Today on the floor of the Senate I saw the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who was celebrating his seventy-fifth birthday, a really star-spangled American and a credit to any party. I am sure he represents the loyal Democrats of this Nation rather than those who get up and scream to high heaven and say, "JOE McCARTHY, you are smearing these poor, innocent Communists." [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

SALE BY MARSHALL PLAN NATIONS OF
STRATEGIC WAR MATERIALS

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to amend section 1302, Public Law 45, Eighty-second Congress, the so-called Kem amendment.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1987) providing for the termination of assistance to foreign countries exporting war materials to Russia or her satellites, introduced by Mr. KEM (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. BYRD, and Mr. MALONE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, this bill would make the following changes in the present law:

First. It would make its provisions applicable to military as well as economic and financial assistance. This would bring within the coverage of the amendment Marshall plan nations who are now engaged in selling strategic war materials to the Reds, and who are now receiving military but not economic assistance from the United States.

Second. It would make its provisions apply regardless of whether the Armed Forces of the United States are actively engaged in hostilities.

Third. It would strike out the proviso that exceptions to the provisions of the amendment may be made at the discretion of the National Security Council.

When the Kem amendment was adopted by the Senate the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] said:

My criticism is that the amendment does not go far enough, in that it would be effective only while the United States is actually engaged in hostilities.

Another criticism is that it denies economic assistance, but it does not deny military assistance. I cannot understand why we should allow any kind of military assistance to any country to which we are denying economic assistance.

We have learned from experience that if we are to stop arming the Communists through our allies, Congress must pass an iron-clad, escape-proof law, that is mandatory upon the President. Two laws with built-in loopholes have failed to accomplish their objective.

Section 1304, Public Law 843, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 27, 1950, provided that no economic or financial assistance was to be provided by the United States to any foreign country whose trade with Russia or its satellites, including Red China, was found by the United States National Security Council to be "contrary to the security interests of the United States."

Under this law, the National Security Council, of which President Truman is Chairman, took no effective action to halt the shocking sale of strategic materials by Marshall-plan countries to the very enemy now killing and maiming our boys in Korea. No action was taken despite the fact that the late Admiral Forrest Sherman told the Senate committees investigating the MacArthur dismissal that the Joint Chiefs of Staff

on March 28, 1951, advised the Secretary of Defense that growing military assistance to Communist China by non-Communist countries other than the United States constituted "a direct threat to the security interests of the United States."

The failure of the National Security Council to act constituted a callous disregard of the safety and welfare of the American boys in Korea. It was contrary to the express will of the Congress.

On May 9, 1951, I introduced, on behalf of myself and other Senators, an amendment to the third supplemental appropriations bill providing that economic or financial assistance would be automatically shut off to any country which continues to sell war materials to the Communists. The Senate approved this amendment unanimously. After the conference committee had made certain changes, including the addition of the ill-fated and misused exception clause, both Houses of Congress approved the bill as amended.

In taking this action, the Congress made clear that it was dissatisfied with the steps which had been taken to halt the flow of war goods to the enemy.

On June 16, 1951, Congress and the American people were shocked and amazed to learn that the National Security Council had suspended entirely the operation of the war-goods-ban amendment for 90 days.

The amendment provides "that exceptions to those provisions may be made upon an official determination of the National Security Council that such exception is in the security interest of the United States."

To except is defined by Webster as "to leave out from a number of a whole."

The National Security Council suspended the whole amendment. This meat-ax approach is entirely unjustified and unjustifiable. This action has no moral, legal, or constitutional basis. It is a flagrant disregard of the express intent of the elected representatives of the people.

Since the National Security Council suspended the amendment more than 5,000 American boys have been killed or wounded in Korea. The shipment of strategic war materials—and I do not mean women's bathing suits—to the Reds who killed or wounded those boys has gone on.

I have obtained fresh evidence that Marshall-plan countries are continuing their vicious sales of strategic materials to the Communists, including the Chinese Reds and North Koreans.

Department of Commerce officials tell us that during the first 3 months of 1951 alone Italy exported \$1,151,000 worth of ball and roller bearings to countries behind the iron curtain. When asked specifically if these shipments are continuing at the present time the answer Department of Commerce officials give is these shipments are continuing.

During May 1951 the British Socialist Government permitted \$275,968 worth of machine tools to be exported to the Soviet Union, compared with only \$54,406 during May 1950. During the 5 months ending May 31, 1951, \$1,539,865

worth of machine tools were sold by the British to the U. S. S. R. and \$1,638,943 worth of electrical generating sets and generators.

I offer the proposed changes in the present law as a way to halt this shameful business.

The Battle bill recently passed by the House will not, in my judgment, meet the situation. It is another discretionary law. We have had experience with two discretionary laws, and the traffic between Marshall-plan countries and the Russian bloc in strategic war materials has gone on unabated. What we need is a mandatory law with teeth in it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. What the distinguished Senator from Missouri is expressing is that under the so-called escape clause, as it is interpreted by ECA, there is permitted to continue in the law a loophole by means of which countries are enabled to engage in the damnable traffic, regardless of the fact that the Senate intended, as I believe it intends now, to have on the books a mandatory statute which would prohibit such traffic. Am I correct?

Mr. KEM. That is exactly correct.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Missouri, who has taken an interest in the subject, is now asking the Senate to amend the legislation sponsored by him so as to delete the escape clause and make the provisions of the legislation mandatory, just as the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] said it should be made mandatory when the Senate adopted the so-called Kem amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. KEM. That is correct. However, I do not believe that the Senator from Arizona touched on that point. The escape clause had not been inserted when the bill passed the Senate. The escape clause was put into the bill in conference.

Mr. WHERRY. What I meant to say was that when the Kem amendment was adopted the Senator from Arizona supported it, and he even said it did not go far enough. This time the hope of the Senator from Missouri is that the Senate will pass a mandatory statute. I should like to ask one more question on that point.

Mr. KEM. In that connection, when the Senate acted on the last occasion, it passed a mandatory law.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. KEM. The escape clause, or the discretionary clause, was inserted in conference.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that the junior Senator from Nebraska was a member of the conference committee and that the conferees were told by those who were particularly requesting the opportunity to have trade continued between one of the Soviet-bloc countries and one of the ECA countries, that the only time the authority would be used would be in connection with the exchange of materials which were of such a character that it was in the interest

of the national defense of the United States that the exchange be made?

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Was it not on that theory that the conferees accepted it, and it came back to the Senate, and the Senate was told what the interpretation was, and the matter was explained? I ask the Senator if that is not far afield from what the ECA Administrator is doing today in the exchange of goods with countries in the Soviet bloc, almost on a country-wide basis.

Mr. KEM. It certainly is far afield, and the express intent of Congress has been flagrantly disregarded.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the Kem amendment, which is attached to the appropriation bill, terminates when the appropriation bill terminates. Therefore, I understand that the measure the Senator has introduced today provides that it will be permanent legislation, so that it will not be necessary to renew it each year.

Mr. KEM. Exactly so. The so-called Kem amendment provided by its terms that it should apply only during a period when we were engaged in hostilities. The bill which I have introduced today contains no such limitation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated as a part of my remarks a memorandum showing the changes made in existing law by the bill which is introduced today. This memorandum was prepared by Mr. Dwight J. Pinion, of the Office of the Legislative Counsel.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 1302 (a) of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951, which became law on June 2, 1951, provides that during any period within which the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in carrying out a decision of the Security Council of the United Nations, no economic or financial assistance may be extended to any foreign country which exports arms, armaments, or military matériel, or commodities which the Secretary of Defense certifies may be used in the manufacture thereof or shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed by the United States, to Russia or any of her satellites, including Communist China and Communist North Korea. Periodic certifications are required from countries receiving economic or financial aid from the United States stating that they have not exported the above items to Russia subsequent to June 17, 1951 (the fifteenth day following the date of enactment of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951). Existing law also permits the National Security Council to make exceptions from the above provisions where, in its opinion, it would be in the security interest of the United States to do so.

In addition to certain clarifying changes made in the language of section 1302 (a), the proposed bill makes three important changes in section 1302 (a).

First, it makes the provisions of section 1302 (a) effective for an indefinite period, so that it would not be limited as at present to periods when we are engaged in armed conflict in carrying out a decision of the United Nations Security Council.

Second, it extends the application of section 1302 (a) to countries receiving military

assistance from the United States. At the present time the law applies only to countries receiving economic and financial aid, and the receipt of military assistance alone does not bring a country within the purview of section 1302 (a).

Third, the bill eliminates all provisions of existing law which relate to the making of exceptions from the provisions of section 1302 (a).

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CITATION OF CERTAIN PERSONS FOR CONTEMPT

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Washington a question in regard to the resolutions which he moved to reconsider, which motions have been agreed to.

Senate Resolution 119 is now the unfinished business. I had hoped that we could dispose of that resolution and the Senate Resolution 120 this afternoon, and would not have to meet tomorrow. However, it now appears that we cannot do so, because I promised my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, who are giving a dinner party in honor of my good friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], that the Senate would take a recess at about 5 o'clock this evening. I am sure that by that time we shall not be able to dispose of these resolutions.

I wonder whether the Senator from Washington will conclude his remarks by 5 o'clock; or will he wish to continue them tomorrow? What is his pleasure in that regard?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I understand fully that the majority leader has been desirous of having these resolutions disposed of, and I understand that was the purpose this afternoon. In that connection the Senator from Maryland and, for the most part, the Senator from Tennessee, and the Senator from Washington have been here all afternoon, to serve the purpose of the majority leader. We still are entirely desirous of cooperating. If the majority leader has in mind having the resolutions taken up the very first thing in the session tomorrow and having the Senate continue with their consideration tomorrow until they are disposed of, I shall be perfectly agreeable to that course.

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly that is our intention.

Let me inquire of the distinguished Senator how long he thinks it will take to dispose of the resolutions. So far as he is concerned, how much time will he need? I am not trying to limit him, but I wish to be sure that we shall be able to complete action on them tomorrow. I think we can do so.

Mr. CAIN. I am quite certain that if the arguments begin immediately following the quorum call, shortly after noon tomorrow, the motions can be disposed of before the day is over.

However, I am not qualified or prepared to make a guess as to how much of the afternoon will be consumed in disposing of the resolutions, for I do not have the slightest idea of the approach to this interesting and important question which is to be taken by the present chairman of the Special Senate

Committee on Crime and also by the past chairman of the Special Committee.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. O'CONOR. In response to the inquiry the Senator has made, I may say that it is our thought that the resolutions should not take more than several hours, at the most. Probably 2 hours would be an approximation which would be quite close to the actual time required. Of course, I do not wish to speak for the Senator from Washington, but I rather imagine that we can conclude in several hours' time.

Mr. CAIN. I was smiling because during the course of the session this afternoon I have seen Senators who intended to speak for only a few minutes proceed to make extended remarks. I have no assurance that a similar situation might not develop tomorrow, although, of course, my suggestion is not in prejudice to the approximation of 2 hours time which has been suggested by my friend, the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order to expedite the consideration of the two resolutions, which is what all of us wish to do, of course—

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] have the floor, and that all debate be germane to the resolutions under consideration, until they are disposed of.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to offer a suggestion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. In order to make certain that Senators who have a positive interest in either side of this question will be here and that all Senators will be advised that debate concerning the question is about to begin, will not the majority leader include in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement that the first order of business tomorrow, at 12 o'clock, will be a quorum call?

Mr. McFARLAND. I meant to add to my unanimous-consent request, provision for what we usually term the transaction of routine business and a quorum call.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although, of course, I shall not object—I wonder whether the majority leader will indicate that it is his intention to have the Senate proceed continuously until it reaches a vote tomorrow on the resolutions. I ask that question for the reason that one of the other members of the committee indicated that he could not be present on Monday, and he desires to take part in the debate, and therefore will be here tomorrow for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is my reason for asking that the discussion be germane.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to say that, so far as I am concerned, I shall be most willing to have the resolutions voted on before the conclusion of the business of the session tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I certainly wish the Record to show that it is not the intention to have such an arrangement establish a precedent. In other words, a part of the proposed unanimous-consent agreement is most unusual, namely, the part calling for the recognition of a certain Senator at a certain time. I may say that I do not object to that, but I do not wish it to be regarded as establishing a precedent in connection with future requests of that sort.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not wish it to be regarded as a precedent, either, because I do not like to have an arrangement made by which a particular Senator is assured of having the floor on a certain day. I prefer to have Senators take their chances on obtaining the floor. However, in this case I wish to accommodate the Senator from Nebraska, and therefore I am willing to have such an arrangement entered into at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? Without objection, the agreement is entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement as subsequently reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That on tomorrow (Friday, August 10, 1951), following the transaction of so-called morning business and a quorum call, the Senate resume the consideration of the resolutions (S. Res. 119 and 120), citing certain persons for contempt of the Senate, that the Senator from Washington (Mr. CAIN) be entitled to the floor, and that all debate on the matter be germane until said resolutions are disposed of (August 10, 1951).

CONFERENCE OF NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS—DEVELOPMENT OF POWER ON THE ST. LAWRENCE RIVER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on July 26 and 27 of this year, five New England Governors and a representative of Governor Lodge, of Connecticut, who was out of the country, held a conference at Osterville, Mass.

This conference was devoted largely to devising means of solving the problem of New England's power shortage.

I wish to read an excerpt from the portion of the minutes of the conference which has reference to the St. Lawrence development:

Following a discussion of the development of power on the St. Lawrence, and upon motion of Governor Payne—

He is the Governor of Maine—

it was unanimously voted that the New England Governor's Conference be recorded as favorable to the development of the St. Lawrence River for power.

It was further moved and voted that the members of the secretariat be directed to follow closely the progress of congressional legislation in this matter and to keep the Governors advised so far as the interests of their respective States and of this region were affected.

It was moved and voted that a copy of the motion relative to the development of power on the St. Lawrence River be forwarded to the dominion and provincial authorities of Canada as evidence of the continued interest of the New England Govern-

nors in obtaining power in this region on the basis of complete international cooperation.

Mr. President, the Governors of the New England States are not radical in any sense of the word. They are not easily panicked. But they do recognize an extreme emergency when they see one.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE GILLETTE, OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S., August 7, 1951.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. WILSON D. GILLETTE, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of 12 Members of the House with such Members of the Senate as may be joined be appointed to attend the funeral.

Resolved, That the Sergeant at Arms of the House be authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary for carrying out the provision of these resolutions and that the necessary expenses in connection therewith be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Resolved, That the clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF], I send to the desk a resolution which I ask to have read and immediately considered.

The resolution (S. Res. 188) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. WILSON D. GILLETTE, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the committee on the part of the Senate to attend the funeral of the late Representative GILLETTE, the Chair appoints the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in keeping with the resolution which has been adopted by the Senate, and as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representative, I move that the Senate do now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, August 10, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 9 (legislative day of August 1), 1951:

UNITED NATIONS

Isador Lubin, of New York, the United States representative on the United Nations Economic and Social Council, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the Advisory Committee to the Agent General of the United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Nora M. Harris, of Connecticut, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn. (Reappointment.)

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Calvin T. Durgin, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of vice admiral.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

D. C. Moore, West Blocton, Ala., in place of B. L. Edmonds, retired.

ARKANSAS

James T. Ross, England, Ark., in place of M. L. Canon, retired.

CALIFORNIA

Mary M. Tibbitts, Alderpoint, Calif., in place of M. L. Partridge, resigned.

Marguerite F. Gilbert, Leevining, Calif., in place of K. C. Adair, resigned.

Neva M. Glaze, Oceano, Calif., in place of H. G. Braden, resigned.

Carroll W. Marsh, Glen Ellen, Calif., in place of B. K. Gore, resigned.

Raymond R. Holmquist, Pasadena, Calif., in place of F. G. Sutherland, resigned.

Donald V. Wheeler, Temple City, Calif., in place of W. E. Emick, retired.

William H. Mitchener, Whittier, Calif., in place of C. E. Stonesipher, retired.

FLORIDA

Madge K. Casey, Gulf Hammock, Fla., in place of Z. V. Smallwood, resigned.

GEORGIA

Watson L. Barger, Sardis, Ga., in place of W. K. Barger, deceased.

ILLINOIS

Randell Louis Arseneau, Beaverville, Ill., in place of L. P. Baron, retired.

Joseph Clyde Layton, Gorham, Ill., in place of J. T. Snider, resigned.

Charles R. Hippard, Maroa, Ill., in place of W. D. Milnes, retired.

INDIANA

Roy O. Uterback, Bargersville, Ind., in place of B. L. Ferguson, retired.

Raymond F. Collins, North Judson, Ind., in place of P. H. McCormick, retired.

Edythe B. Yount, Southport, Ind., in place of J. M. Totten, removed.

John P. Delaney, Winamac, Ind., in place of Charles Lebo, deceased.

IOWA

James C. Calvin, Lenox, Iowa, in place of J. B. Wood, transferred.

Charles W. Beigel, Onawa, Iowa, in place of A. W. Moore, retired.

Daniel M. Fairchild, Terril, Iowa, in place of S. H. Nelson, transferred.

KANSAS

Eldon E. Moore, Gardner, Kans., in place of W. E. Gallanaugh, deceased.

Richard R. Miller, Greeley, Kans., in place of Kenneth Grove, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Arnold G. Trahan, Morgan City, La., in place of H. L. Jolley, resigned.

MAINE

Jean C. Tanguay, Greene, Maine, in place of J. M. Tanguay, retired.

MARYLAND

Edward L. Best, White Hall, Md., in place of H. H. Wiley, resigned.

MICHIGAN

John D. Turner, Caro, Mich., in place of D. R. Ellwanger, transferred.

John L. Romsek, Copemish, Mich., in place of C. V. Moody, retired.

Norval J. Morrow, Durand, Mich., in place of D. C. Moore, retired.

Gordon W. Briggs, Grand Ledge, Mich., in place of H. M. Byington, retired.

Walter Schanz, Kalamazoo, Mich., in place of H. A. Newcomb, deceased.

John S. Dye, New Baltimore, Mich., in place of A. A. LeFevre, retired.

George Timpona, Plymouth, Mich., in place of H. E. Irwin, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Fylla S. Petersen, Circle Pines, Minn., established December 1, 1948.

Stanley C. Beniek, Little Falls, Minn., in place of P. J. Vasaly, retired.

Zala G. Hassell, Renville, Minn., in place of T. D. O'Connor, resigned.

Burtis E. Hyatt, Waubun, Minn., in place of C. E. S. Gunderson, resigned.

MISSOURI

Donald L. Haden, Frankford, Mo., in place of C. E. Latimer, retired.

MONTANA

William H. McLauchlan, Big Timber, Mont., in place of C. C. Nicholson, deceased.

Patrick E. Freeman, Brady, Mont., in place of J. L. Rose, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Garnet Walters, Elsie, Nebr., in place of T. K. McCown, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Frances B. Engelsen, Barnegat Light, N. J., in place of Bertha Applegate, retired.

William H. Conway, West Long Branch, N. J., in place of T. O. Wood, resigned.

NEW YORK

Rene J. Panuska, East Islip, N. Y., in place of A. B. Melton, resigned.

John A. McGarr, Oyster Bay, N. Y., in place of B. H. Powers, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Lottie W. Johnson, Hanes, N. C., in place of A. C. Haley, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Oscar K. Sovig, Arnegard, N. Dak., in place of C. E. Fleck, retired.

Herbert W. Booth, Towner, N. Dak., in place of C. J. Haman, removed.

OHIO

Von W. Spellman, Ada, Ohio, in place of C. D. Hindall, deceased.

George W. Henning, New Matamoras, Ohio, in place of J. W. Berentz, retired.

Gerald D. Keller, Oberlin, Ohio, in place of M. A. Houghton, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Paul E. Baker, Beggs, Okla., in place of W. A. Jenkins, deceased.

Charles W. Mason, Nowata, Okla., in place of J. T. Norton, retired.

Alline B. Thomas, Ryan, Okla., in place of Douglas Thomas, deceased.

Quinton R. Beavers, Watts, Okla., in place of G. P. Hines, transferred.

OREGON

George W. Dee, Madras, Oreg., in place of M. B. Johnson, retired.

Marvin N. Brannon, Mount Vernon, Oreg., in place of Gertrude Tulloch, retired.

Minnie Marie Furry, Phoenix, Oreg., in place of Modine Skinner, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Charles Oceppek, Claridge, Pa., in place of J. W. Supancik, resigned.

Carroll J. Daly, Greentown, Pa., in place of S. R. Hazelton, resigned.

Walter W. Gress, Meyersdale, Pa., in place of J. G. Weakland, deceased.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Lois E. Massey, Pawleys Island, S. C., in place of D. M. Bellamy, deceased.

Lloyd F. Van Norte, Edisto Island, S. C., in place of W. S. Hills, transferred.

TEXAS

Vincent C. Wright, Buna, Tex., in place of J. F. Allbritton, retired.

Elvan J. Goodwin, Manor, Tex., in place of W. H. Wentland, retired.

Thurman T. Saxon, Richland Springs, Tex., in place of E. M. Coffey, resigned.

Lloyd T. Fraim, San Juan, Tex., in place of F. C. Platt, resigned.

Edward O. Garrett, Utopia, Tex., in place of W. E. McIntosh, retired.

Virgil Jamison, Jr., Wheeler, Tex., in place of C. L. Lewis, transferred.

Bernard W. Clayton, Wolfe City, Tex., in place of O. W. Stone, retired.

UTAH

Clyde E. Weeks, Orem, Utah, in place of L. M. McDonald, removed.

VERMONT

Timothy M. Donahue, Northfield, Vt., in place of W. H. Moriarty, retired.

VIRGINIA

Charles F. Crowgey, Emory, Va., in place of J. W. Helvey, retired.

Alfred A. Tuell, Glade Spring, Va., in place of Martin Rosenbaum, retired.

Carroll E. Beach, Luray, Va., in place of B. N. Kibler, retired.

Richard M. Shepherd, North Garden, Va., in place of Julia Maloney, retired.

WISCONSIN

Clare G. Blaylock, Gordo, Wis., in place of R. E. Lawler, removed.

George F. Rasmussen, Neenah, Wis., in place of C. G. Schultz, deceased.

WYOMING

Vella T. Braman, Moran, Wyo., in place of C. E. Fesler, retired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 9 (legislative day of August 1), 1951:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY:

Admiral William M. Fechteler, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral for a term of 4 years.

Vice Adm. Donald B. Duncan, United States Navy, to be Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of admiral while so serving.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Peter Campbell Brown, of New York, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 2 years.

David J. Coddaira, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 1 year.

Kathryn McHale, of Indiana, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 1 year.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. James Fife, Jr., United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Operations).

Admiral Lynde D. McCormick, United States Navy, to be commander in chief, Atlantic and United States Atlantic Fleet, with the rank of admiral while so serving.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose divine providence is always beneficent in its character and purpose and abundantly adequate to supply our needs, we thank Thee for the many revelations of Thy continuing care and goodness.

May we now in all humility and simplicity render unto Thee the tribute of our heartfelt adoration and praise. Grant that the sincerity of our gratitude may be manifested in renewed consecration.

We rejoice that daily we may commit ourselves to the leading of Thy spirit as we strive to find the right solution to our many perplexing problems.

Enlarge our minds and hearts with sympathy and good will toward all mankind and may we fulfill Thy righteous law by doing unto others as we would that they should do unto us.

Together we confess our sins and together we seek Thy mercy and pardoning grace in the name of our blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 149]

Abernethy	Fine	Price
Allen, Ill.	Fogarty	Prouty
Allen, La.	Frazier	Quinn
Arends	Gordon	Rabaut
Bailey	Gore	Radwan
Barden	Grant	Rains
Baring	Gwinn	Rankin
Bates, Ky.	Havener	Rees, Kans.
Beall	Hébert	Rhodes
Betts	Hedrick	Rooney
Blatnik	Hess	Sabath
Boggs, La.	Hillings	Saylor
Bosone	Hinshaw	Scott
Boykin	Jenison	Hugh D., Jr.
Breen	Johnson	Scudder
Brehm	Kee	Shelley
Buckley	Kennedy	Short
Busbey	Latham	Smith, Kans.
Camp	Lesinski	Spence
Chatham	Lucas	Staggers
Chelf	McCarthy	Steed
Colmer	McDonough	Stockman
Cox	McGrath	Sutton
Crosser	Machrowicz	Taylor
Dague	Mack, Ill.	Walter
Davis, Tenn.	Miller, Calif.	Welch
Dawson	Miller, N. Y.	Werdell
Delaney	Mitchell	Wheeler
Dingell	Morgan	Whitaker
Dollinger	Morris	Whitten
Doughton	Moulder	Wilson, Tex.
Durham	Murray, Tenn.	Wolcott
Eaton	Murray, Wis.	Wood, Ga.
Eberhart	O'Konski	Wood, Idaho
Ellsworth	Passman	Woodruff
Elston	Patten	Yorty
Engle	Poulson	
Fallon	Powell	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 321 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the House to consider under the general rules of the House the bill (H. R. 4521) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, and that general debate be limited to a period not exceeding 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the majority and the minority.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but for the information of the House this will bring the bill up as squarely as if it came from the Committee on Rules.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And then it will be read under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it is the purpose to bring it up on Monday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 311, making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to have the gentleman explain this bill a little for the benefit of the Members.

Mr. DENTON. This is an immediate supplemental appropriation bill for the purpose of carrying out Public Law 78, which is commonly called the wetback bill. It provides for an appropriation of \$950,000, of which \$750,000 shall be for the establishment of working capital for a revolving fund. You remember that under the wetback bill the contractors for Mexican labor pay \$15 per worker, and this \$15 will go back into the revolving fund. The remaining \$200,000 is for administrative expenses, for recruiting Mexican labor, for quarantine, and sundry expenses. A much larger appropriation has been asked for, and that is being considered by the committee at this time. But this is only an immediate supplemental appropriation, and the amount of money allowed at this time will be credited

against the sum subsequently appropriated.

There is serious need for this legislation at the present time. The Department of Agriculture has ruled that all cotton stalks in the lower Rio Grande Valley in Texas must be plowed under by September 16 in order to control the pink bollworm. Stalks in Laredo, Winter Garden, and Eagle Pass areas must be plowed under by October 1. In the Rio Grande Valley alone the crop, which is now being harvested, comprises approximately 900,000 acres, yielding about 700,000 bales.

Other Texas areas and the States of Arkansas, Arizona, Missouri, Louisiana, and New Mexico have requested and will require Mexican nationals to harvest cotton, while California will require them beginning the middle of August for the fruit, vegetable, and cotton harvests, according to the testimony received by the committee. So, there is a serious need for this labor at the present time. We have asked that only a skeleton force be set up and no action beyond that be taken until the supplemental appropriation is acted upon.

We have also recommended that the Department of Labor, in their haste to set up this operation, be sure to safeguard the labor laws, that is, be sure there is no American labor available in that territory and that the prevailing wage is paid.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, this bill has the unanimous consent and approval of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations, and I favor it. Therefore, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, the following sum:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

For necessary expenses to enable the Secretary of Labor to discharge his responsibilities under the provisions of the act of July 12, 1951 (Public Law 78), \$950,000, of which \$750,000 shall be for the establishment of a working capital fund, such fund to be used for the payment of those expenses for which employers are liable under agreements entered into pursuant to section 502 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended by the act of July 12, 1951, and such fund to be reimbursed from payments made to the United States by employers pursuant to such agreements: *Provided*, That expenditures from this appropriation shall be charged to the applicable appropriations when enacted into law.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5054, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from New York is ranking minority member of the subcommittee and of the whole Committee on Appropriations and he has done a workmanlike job on the pending bill. His services to the committee and the country are very great indeed.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the gentleman from New York worked with the committee for weeks on this bill, and that he was not able to be present yesterday, I ask unanimous consent, if it is his pleasure, that he be permitted to proceed for an additional 5 minutes, or for any additional time he may require.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe I will need very much more. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to discuss at this time the details of this bill. There are some things that I believe should be spoken of now, however. I feel a responsibility to discuss them myself.

We have had a great deal of agitation in the past 4 or 5 years for the so-called performance budget. The Committee on Armed Services was inveigled into placing a requirement for that in the unification bill. So far as it has proceeded, and so far as our experience with it is concerned, the performance budget idea has been used for the purpose of consolidating appropriations and covering up the activities of the armed services in such a way that it makes it almost absolutely impossible for the Committee on Appropriations to find out what the whole picture is as of today. It takes days and days, which should not be spent, and which would not be spent, if these justifications were made up properly and gave us the details which we need in order to form an intelligent judgment of what should be appropriated. I believe that our 11-week hearings could have been reduced by at least 3 weeks, if the justifications and the information which should be provided had been properly provided for us.

The full situation is such that there is only one way out of it, if we are going to continue operating that way, and that is for the Committee on Appropriations, and frankly if I have an opportunity to

dc so I am going to propose it another year, to break down every one of these appropriations into the different sub-heads under which they are operated and fix the detail of the situation in such shape that the armed services should pay some attention to the Congress and what we provide.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the minority adequately represented on these subcommittees and do you have an opportunity to learn what is in the bill, except what you as a Congressman individually may learn from your own inquiry?

Mr. TABER. The minority upon this committee consists of three members, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], and myself. The majority consists of four members, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY]. There has never been a time during the operation of this committee that the minority has not been given every opportunity to develop any information they could get out of the witnesses. The worst trouble with the picture has been that the witnesses that were produced did not know enough about their subject that they could make intelligent answers to the questions which were asked of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I am going to make this suggestion. I think in order to obtain any satisfactory supervision over the operation of the armed services establishment, the appropriations subcommittee itself should have a staff which would go into the question of what the armed services are doing with the money they are spending; and that that operation should begin and be practically continuous all the way through. I do not think we can afford to be parsimonious about the expenditure of a small sum of money for the committee to do the job. Frankly, I think that job could be done better under the supervision of the armed services subcommittee than in any other way.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is not my purpose to be critical at all, but here you are with a \$56,000,000 appropriation. There have been many statements about waste and extravagance and unnecessary billions in there. But I do not know. What am I to do? How can I intelligently determine how I should vote?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, it is an exceedingly difficult matter for anybody,

either a member of the subcommittee or not, to know exactly what should be done. The only way we can tell is by the investigation that we are able to make.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Within three or four billion would satisfy me.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I do not think that we are able to get the quality and quantity of information with reference to this subject that would place us in the best position to pass on the validity of all the items that are contained in the bill.

Last year, when the Korean business came on all of a sudden, there was practically no scrutiny on the part of the committee. Such a thing was practically impossible. At the present time we have tried to give it as much scrutiny as was possible in the time we have had available. But the armed services did not present their budget to the Congress at all until the 1st of May. If we had had the budget for the armed services by the middle of January, as we should have, it would have been possible for us to hold hearings and be ready to report more intelligently by the middle of May. I doubt very much if, under any circumstances, we could possibly have been ready with a report that would be intelligent before the middle of May at the very earliest. Perhaps it would have been the 1st of June. But I do feel that we must take such steps in the committee by breaking down the different items and insisting upon justifications which thoroughly explain the items and on witnesses who will tell us the story. I do not want to be captious. I do not want to place undue burdens upon the services, but the very least that they can do in their presentations to the Congress is to tell what the money is wanted for and to be perfectly frank and open and aboveboard with the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. At this time I am not going any further than I have gone. I just wanted to call attention to these facts and to the situation and to say that we are facing a very serious situation. To my mind the armed services, and every other department of the Government, must come before the Congress with an intelligent, straightforward statement, prepared to go into details as far as is necessary, to explain the reason for their requests. Unless that is done, it is absolutely impossible for the Congress intelligently to legislate and appropriate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the matter of civilian personnel is something that gives Members very great concern. The Department of Defense had on June 30 about 1,170,000 civilians on the payroll. This

includes white-collar and blue-collar workers.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. Is it not also true that although we are authorizing the employment of additional people it does not mean that all of those people are going to be placed on the payroll overnight? This is a continuing build-up, and during that build-up the committee is going to continue to scrutinize very closely what takes place in the Pentagon and the Department of Defense generally, so that we will have a hand on the program, and we will insist very strenuously from time to time that they not employ more personnel than they actually require.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am wondering if in view of the astronomical size of this appropriation, the unprecedented size of it, the Committee on Appropriations is setting up any sort of organization to oversee in a way the expenditure of these funds.

Mr. MAHON. We are constantly, week in and week out, trying to keep in close touch with these expenditures and we have investigators at work at all times. We do have a staff, which is not at present fully adequate, but additional men are being recruited. We do need more assistance.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. On June 1, 1950, there were 317,567 white-collar clerical workers in the Army, Navy and Air Force. On July 1 last there were 494,363. I understand that figure has been increasing about a thousand a day since that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. In the bill now before the committee, you are asking funds to support 641,765 purely white collar workers. During World War II, at the highest peak of the war in June 1945, we had one civilian employee to 15 uniformed men. If the full number of white collar workers is allowed as requested in this bill you will have 1 to every 5.2 uniformed men.

My question is, How can we justify appropriating billions of dollars for so many civilian employees that you are asking for in this bill when we know that at the present time there are over 18,000 civilian employees, white collar employees, working in the Pentagon alone, with very little to do in proportion to what they should do, and how

can you justify piling on more civilian employees?

Mr. MAHON. Well, the gentleman heard my previous remarks that efforts are being made to reduce the civilian personnel to the very lowest minimum. I should like to say, however, that a Congressman cannot run his office, a newspaper cannot put out the paper, the Pentagon cannot handle tens of thousands of letters and communications each day, one cannot run his farm in Iowa or in Texas without people.

Mr. JENSEN. We understand all that.

Mr. MAHON. You cannot run a base without people, you cannot have airplanes and ships in operation without people, you cannot operate this big Government without a lot of people.

Mr. JENSEN. And I want to remind the gentleman that a private business cannot employ two or three times more people than they need and avoid going bankrupt. That is what we are doing in this instance.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will read my remarks which will appear hereafter in the RECORD he will receive considerable information. I share his desire to effect every possible economy in manpower and money and resources.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. One thing the gentleman's committee is trying to do is to get the men in uniform off of the civilian jobs and get them where they will be in the combat line.

Mr. MAHON. We could reduce the white-collar workers by 200,000 and let the military people do much of the work which is now being done by civilians. When we get our men fully trained, and we have a proper build-up and everything is in shape, if that time happily comes 2 or 3 years from now, we can perhaps let the military personnel do a lot of work now being done by the civilians.

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Now, I want to take a few minutes to tell you some of the facts about civilian personnel in the Department. I am speaking about those connected with regular military functions and not those on such programs as Army civil functions and mutual defense aid for which funds are provided in other bills. I want to give you a few over-all figures as to how many people they have, how many they requested for 1952, what classes and types of personnel they are, what functions they are assigned to in broad terms, and the reductions the committee has recommended.

As has been stated, we have in the past year appropriated very large sums to increase our military forces and to provide them with the necessary ships, planes, tanks, guns, and other equipment and facilities. Larger sums are included in the pending bill. We have provided and are continuing to provide for expanding our industrial production to meet these needs. We are reactivating defense plants and installations, buying and channeling new equipment to the forces and into depots. New

equipment has to be inspected. Billions of dollars worth of old equipment and installations have to be maintained and operated. Our defense program is still in the build-up stage in many respects and will be for many months to come. The military program is a tremendously large undertaking, and it requires people to do the job. In consequence, the Department has been increasing its civilian personnel for more than a year. This bill provides funds for further increases in personnel but not to the extent requested.

Everybody throughout the country, even people in Government, and certainly Members of Congress, seem to agree that there is waste and extravagance in utilization by the Government of civilian personnel. From my investigations I want to say that I certainly agree with this view. After all, 150,000,000 Americans cannot be wrong.

We cannot condone such waste and inefficiency especially at a time when we must make sure that every dollar we must spend counts. One of the best ways to cut civilian personnel is through better management by the Defense Department on the Washington level with a follow-through down to each installation and activity. The crying need is for better management from top to bottom. That we have demanded of the Department of Defense and we have received assurances of cooperation. If our request is properly heeded by the Defense Establishment, the reduction in civilian personnel will be below the reductions made in the bill by the committee. We shall hopefully await results. Better ways of devising reductions can be discovered within the Military Establishment than without.

I shall cite some over-all figures. For the fiscal year 1951, when you add in all the supplementals during the year, the Department had funds for about 1,279,000 civilian positions. They estimated that on June 30, 1951, they would have about 1,261,000 people on board. But they did not reach that total. According to the best figures we have, their actual on-board strength last June 30 was about 1,170,000.

For fiscal year 1952 they requested about 1,494,000 positions, or 214,000 more than the 1,279,000 for 1951. They assumed that at June 30, 1952—the end of fiscal 1952—they would have on board a total of about 1,459,000 employees. That is people on board. If they were to reach that total, it would mean an increase in people during this present fiscal year of about 289,000 above the 1,170,000 they had on board last June 30. The number on the rolls is always some below the number of positions, because they cannot keep every position filled all the time.

You know, these budgets are made for personnel in terms of what they call man-years. That is the term they use, and it simply means a full 12 months' employment and pay. When you are building up your personnel throughout the year, you do not ask for money for all the people for the full year—you put in only for the part of the year you expect to have the people on the roll. I mention that because when we marked up the bill, we made our reductions in man-years.

The reductions in numbers of people will run higher. So, for man-years, the 1951 total was estimated at approximately 1,013,000 and the 1952 total requested is 1,375,000, an increase of 362,000.

WHITE- AND BLUE-COLLARED EMPLOYEES

So that Members of the House will have a better understanding of these huge figures, I want to give you some breakdown of them. Take the 1,170,000 that were on the rolls on June 30. Of that number, 730,000 were what they refer to as blue-collar workers. That is about 62 percent of the total. They are the people who work in the shipyards, the arsenals, the repair and overhaul of planes and ships, the maintenance and operation of posts, camps, stations, depots, and so on. The other 38 percent total 440,000 who are the so-called white-collared workers. They likewise cover a multitude of functions and activities and are located all over the world. They include of course people here in the Pentagon and elsewhere around Washington, at command headquarters, in procurement work, at hospitals, research and development people, service-wide supply and other administrative activities, and of course most of them are located at the same places the so-called blue-collar people are. Of the 289,000 more they wanted to put on during this year, 184,000 are blue-collar and 105,000 are in the white-collar category. Now, there is inefficient use and overstaffing in the blue-collar category as well as in the white collars but I think this breakdown will give you a little better idea of the classes of civilian personnel in the military.

CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES BY MAJOR TYPES OF WORK

Let me give you a breakdown this way. I think this is a revealing breakdown of the very large number of civilian employees.

The approximately 1,500,000 civilian personnel to be in the defense establishment in the current fiscal year 1952 are distributed as follows:

Type of work	Number	Percent
Directly engaged in procurement, production, maintenance, and operation of major matériel programs.....	580,000	40.0
Maintenance of equipment, reactivation of stations and operation of depot supply systems.....	542,000	35.0
Medical.....	54,918	3.7
Recruiting, training, and instruction.....	60,446	4.0
Civilian components.....	22,658	1.5
Research and development.....	77,040	5.1
Industrial mobilization.....	9,528	.6
Establishment-wide activities.....	48,836	3.2
Administration.....	78,635	5.2
Finance.....	23,613	1.6
Other.....	8,394	.6

You will note from this list that about 3 out of every 4 civilian employees of the Defense Department are directly engaged in producing, overhauling, and rehabilitating the planes, ships, and weapons of war; maintaining the stations; or in providing arms to the troops.

COMMITTEE REDUCTIONS IN CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

As I said, the total man-years estimated for 1952 is 1,375,000. I also indicated that the Department came into the fiscal year 1952 with considerably less people on board than they had expected. We have taken that fact into account in

making our recommendations. Now what reductions have we made? Specifically, we have made reductions approximating 52,000 man-years and total funds of approximately \$145,000,000. That number of man-years, or full year employment, that much of a cut on a man-year basis means considerably more when it is stated in terms of actual numbers of employees. Because this budget was made on the assumption of an ascending rate of civilian personnel employment, I feel confident in estimating that the reduction of 52,000 man-years is the equivalent of roughly 75,000 to 80,000 actual employees who otherwise would go on the rolls during this fiscal year.

There are two points I want to make about these reductions in civilian personnel. First, we could make much larger cuts in civilian personnel by deciding that more of the production work in Government arsenals, shipyards, and the like was going to be contracted out to private industry and therefore let private industry do the hiring instead of the Government. This would accomplish very substantial reductions in Federal employment, but we would still have to appropriate the money to pay private industry for doing the work. Possibly much of the maintenance and repair work at posts, bases, camps, and stations could be contracted out and thus further reduce the number of employees but not necessarily the cost. I feel that private industry, big and little, should be encouraged to the maximum in the defense effort, but to close all Government shops, arsenals, shipyards, and so forth, and contract the work to private industry at this stage would mean a terrific slowdown in the defense effort and vastly greater costs to the taxpayer. Of course, we know that in some of these things it would not be feasible to go very far in that direction because it would be foolish to let Government facilities, for example, stand idle when they were needed in the defense effort.

The other point—and the details are too complicated to discuss here—is that while I have given you over-all civilian personnel figures for 1952, not all the funds for those people are in this bill we are now considering. A good deal of the personnel are being paid from funds previously appropriated for work undertaken in such things as shipbuilding and work in various Government arsenals. It is important that that fact be kept in mind.

We have tried to apply our judgment as best we could to the requests that were before us for civilian personnel. I feel that the cuts are fully in order. In some instances they may not have been deep enough, but the committee was anxious not to injure the defense program in any way. The Department has a serious responsibility to do a better job in determining their needs for personnel, employing only what they need, and making the best use possible of those they do hire. We have got to make the most of our manpower and other resources.

PUBLIC INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

Incidentally, in connection with these reductions in civilian personnel, I want to mention that we feel—and so state in our report—that some cuts are in order against public information activities in the departments. We have inquired into that subject, and the details are in the printed hearings. We believe they have too many people assigned to that kind of work. I mention this particularly because the House on other bills has evidenced some concern about the number of people employed for information and publicity work in the various departments of the Government, and has made some reductions or placed limitations on expenditures for such purposes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I have asked for this time, and the additional time, to speak, if I may, as one of the run-of-the-mine Members of the House who does not have the privilege of serving on either the great Committee on Appropriations or on the equally great Committee on Armed Services. I speak as one of those who is not at all certain just what this bill provides or what all of the items in it means. I believe, in speaking as I will, that I will perhaps be representing a great portion of the membership of this House, or, at least, that which they are thinking.

I question very seriously that there are many Americans who can comprehend or understand what the huge amount carried in the total appropriation as provided in this bill, \$56,062,405,890, really means. Certainly, there are few of us here who can read this bill, fully understand it, and know all, or even very much, about it. The report of the Appropriations Subcommittee was made available only a few short hours ago. I do not know, and I do not believe many Members of this Congress, including many members of the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations, for whom I have the highest regard and the highest respect, and who, I realize have worked diligently and hard and long, know whether or not the appropriation items contained in this bill are actually needed, or whether these proposed expenditures are adequately justified.

But I am convinced of one thing, and believe most of the membership of the House will agree with me, that those who represent and speak for the armed services of our country have asked for at least as much money as they expected to get, and perhaps have asked for even a great deal more than they believed the Congress would appropriate.

Let us get down to facts for a minute.

As an individual Member of this House, one who has not had the privilege of serving on either of these great committees, I do not know whether some of

the items contained in this bill are necessary or unnecessary—whether the amounts requested are too large or too small.

Let us take some of the appropriation items. For instance, let us turn to page 10, if you have the bill before you. Let us take the amount provided for the pay of the Army, \$3,297,076,000. I do not believe there is anyone in the world who knows whether that last \$76,000, or that the last \$297,000,000 for that matter, will be needed or not. I certainly do not. I am simply going to have to accept that item on the word of the committee, and on the word of the military officers who requested it, that it is necessary.

Let us take the travel item down lower on page 10, amounting to \$245,000,000. I do not know, and I do not believe any of you here know, whether it is necessary to spend \$245,000,000 for travel or whether the military could get by on \$145,000,000, or whether it may become necessary to spend \$300,000,000 for travel. So we are just shooting in the dark.

We can go on through this bill, item by item. How much will be needed for this activity and how much for that activity? I do not know, and I do not believe anyone else knows, including those who head our Armed Forces, how much will be necessary to provide an adequate national defense.

However, I do know one thing from my own knowledge and experience, and that is that our so-called "high brass" have been just as wrong in the past, many, many times, as any of us who are here have ever been wrong. I do not believe those in the Pentagon are either omnipotent or omniscient. I do not believe they know all and we know nothing.

I do know one other thing, too; some of the committees of this House, notably a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, headed, I believe, by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes], have conducted studies and investigations and made reports showing all sorts of waste and extravagance can be found in our military effort.

I do know that we, as Members of Congress, as representatives of the people, have a responsibility to take every step, and to engage in every proper action to see to it the money the American people are paying in the form of taxes to support their Government, and to maintain an adequate and necessary national defense, is expended wisely and well.

I do know the average American who has never served in Congress or on a congressional committee has the idea that our military forces are wasteful in many of their expenditures and endeavors, and often demand public moneys which they do not need. I do know that some of us who made some investigations during World War II found every evidence of much waste, extravagance, and poor judgment in the spending of defense funds.

I also know there is a strong conviction within the mind of the average American citizen that there is a great waste of personnel in the Government, including the military or defense

branches of the Government, and that we have civilian employees falling all over themselves in most Federal offices and military installations. I do not know what would happen if the average American citizen could visit some of our military installations and see the number of employees who are sitting around and doing little of real value or making much of a contribution to our national defense effort for the money they are being paid.

I do know that the American people would be as shocked as I have been if they could visit some of the coffee bars in the Pentagon during office hours. Seemingly about the only public officials who are staying on the job here in Washington and fighting a 7-day week war these days are the Members of Congress and their office staffs, because time after time I have had the experience that from Friday evening on, and generally from 3 or 4 o'clock Friday afternoon, I should like to say to the chairman of the subcommittee, until Monday morning, of being unable to find anybody at the Pentagon to answer a question for me. So I say to you, it is my fixed conviction—and I have been forced to come to this conclusion—that we have the responsibility to see to it that there is established or created some sort of a "watchdog committee" or organization representing all of us here in the House, because you and I as individual Members cannot do it, which will ride herd on these appropriations we are making here today which we have to accept on faith unless we can get absolute evidence they are not needed and are unnecessary. Such evidence is rather difficult to get, as I am sure the members of this subcommittee will agree. We should have this "watchdog committee" or organization made up—and this is just a suggestion—of an equal number of members from the Committee on Armed Services, from the Committee on Appropriations, from the Committee on Expenditures, and, perhaps an equal number from the general House membership to represent all of us, to see to it that the funds appropriated by this bill are spent as we intend, and as the American people who are making the great sacrifices to furnish the money which we are appropriating, expect their money to be spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I think that such a "watchdog committee" should be above politics. I therefore believe it should be bipartisan. We should not have any majority or any minority on such a committee. That committee should be given a sufficient staff of experts and investigators to ferret out, if you please, any waste or extravagance in our defense effort wherever it may exist. If such a committee does nothing else in the world, it will at least be a good traffic cop. Remember when the traffic policeman, the motor-

cycle cop, or the highway patrolman is on duty on a main highway somehow or other the traffic begins to flow at the proper rate of speed, there is not so much cutting of corners, and not nearly so many accidents. That is exactly what we need in connection with these appropriations. So I hope we will meet our full responsibility in seeing to it there is some sort of organization such as I have suggested created to do the job which must be done because fifty-six billion-and-some-odd-million dollars we are voting here today is not chicken feed. It represents the sweat, the toil, and the sacrifices, if you please, of some 154,000,000 Americans. So let us do a complete job and follow up to see that the money we appropriate is spent in the proper way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio. I concur in what he said. As a matter of fact, we had some desultory discussion on this same subject in the Committee on Rules the other day when the Committee on Armed Services had up its big authorization bill, which will come before the House in a few days. It seems to me that the investigations which now go on relative to the expenditure of these huge sums of money are disorganized in that they are conducted by several committees. I rather hope that those committees which are now conducting independent investigations, many of which necessarily overlap each other, will get together and talk this thing over and see if they could not agree upon some sort of joint select committee that will take over the whole job.

There are three committees that are undertaking to do the very job that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has been talking about. The Armed Services Committee has a staff. They have a subcommittee, headed by the very able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]. They are investigating the expenditure of these funds. The chairman just said, in response to my question a few minutes ago, that the Appropriations Committee had a staff investigating the expenditure of these funds. The regular standing committee for this purpose is the Committee on Expenditures, and they have a staff and a very efficient subcommittee which is also doing the same thing. Necessarily, they overlap. None of these committees, in my judgment, has the type of staff or the size of staff that enables them to do an efficient job. Just think of the huge sums of money that are going to be expended in this effort—\$56,000,000,000—and we are passing it with 1 day of general debate and another day under the 5-minute rule. And that is just 1 year. That is just a starter. Then, the Armed Services Committee now has a bill before the House for authorization for another five or six billion dollars. Then they are coming along with a supplemental appropriation. Incidentally, one of them is for expenditures in the Korean war, which

is not included at all in this bill. When you think of these stupendous sums of money and you think of human nature as it is, we all realize there is going to be some money wasted and maybe a little money stolen. Many of these things will not happen if this Congress is keeping an eye on the situation.

I want to say in conclusion I endorse the suggestion made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and I hope the committees concerned, namely, the Expenditures Committee, Appropriations Committee, and Armed Services Committee, will get together and see if they cannot agree upon a special committee, composed of members from those three committees, some members at large from the House, and ask for a sufficient staff that will do a real job on this thing, because if you spend a million dollars on a staff to overlook this situation you will save many, many times that much money, if you do not do anything but overlook it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Agreeing with what you say, because I think I am in the same situation as many Members, this seems like a lot of money, but I do not know how much of it is needed. However, is it not true that on the Appropriations Committee the majority party denied us fair representation, so that we are crippled a little right there?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Now the gentleman knows I am not here to indulge in any partisan talk. Whether you got a fair deal in the distribution of committees I am not going into. Aside from that, we should try to inspect the expenditure of these huge sums.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I congratulate the gentleman on what he has said, and I am proud and happy that he has agreed with my general remarks. I am very much pleased that he has included, as I intended to include but neglected to do so, the Expenditures Committee, which also has jurisdiction of the matters being considered.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I hope our joint efforts this morning may bear some fruit with the committees involved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I can assure the gentleman the members of the committee are just as much interested as is the gentleman in this proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know you are.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to call your specific attention to this fact: that every dollar that is in this bill has been authorized by this Congress, and you had better start scrutinizing your authorizations before you start picking a fuss with your Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know what the gentleman refers to, but my good friend from California and my constituent knows that I would not quarrel with him about anything.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is not a question of quarreling; it is a question of starting at the premise of the thing. In other words, when you have an authorization for a manpower limitation within your military it becomes incumbent upon the Congress of this country at least to carry out the original authorization, and our scrutiny of what is being effected here should have its inception back at the time these original proposals come before the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. What I have said should be of assistance to both the Committee on Appropriations and the Armed Services Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia may proceed for one additional minute to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. May I state that I think both the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Virginia have proposed something which is extremely important. It is unfortunately true that however conscientious, sincere, painstaking, and thorough may be the effort of the several committees which now are investigating these matters, there is overlapping, there is a loss of effort by shotgun charges. It would be much more effective, result in much greater saving and in more efficiency if such a watchdog committee could be established and be properly staffed to screen and scrutinize constantly all of the tremendous expenditures of Government.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in support of this \$56,000,000,000 defense appropriation bill.

I think the failure of the administration to come forth with a clear-cut American foreign policy has made it necessary for us all to support this bill. We have to support it or give in to communism. The danger we find ourselves today is so great that to oppose this bill would be to court disaster.

Nevertheless, I would like to make a few observations in the short time allotted to me. First, I do not feel the military branches of this Government should be above economy. Hardly a day goes by that I do not receive a letter from a constituent telling of some waste within the military branches, both in manpower and in material. Many of the Reserves who were called into the Armed Forces immediately following

Korea have become disillusioned by some of the actions of their superiors. We hear of examples of officers and men who are sitting around in the Army camps with nothing to do. They do not know why they are there and their superiors cannot give a proper explanation. The waste of matériel has been serious enough as evidenced by the report of the Appropriations Committee, but the manpower waste has been a calamity.

A second observation which I consider to be even more alarming is the loss of talent within the Armed Forces. We are losing some of our top military leaders. No one in the Defense Department seems to have an explanation for the loss but, Mr. Chairman, do not you think it is serious when in the first half of 1951 the Defense Department received requests for retirement of 27 Army generals, 22 Navy admirals, and 10 Air Force generals. With the situation as serious as it is in the Far East, we need men like MacArthur and Wedemeyer. But this does not seem to alarm the administration. They apparently want to supplement the best military minds with "yes men."

Mr. Chairman, my third observation will be made in the form of a question. That question is: What are we defending today? Is it an ideal, a way of life, or a system? If the dollar cost, the regimentation, and the militarism of the defense program destroys that ideal, way of life, or system, we end up with nothing to defend.

The cost of this appropriation bill to the people of Nebraska will be about \$500,000,000. To the workers, farmers, and small-business men of the State this means toil, sacrifice, hardship, and self-denial.

But Nebraskans have sacrificed both in money and lives in all of the recent wars. They will do it again, but they are saying that it is time for us to practice some economy within and without our Defense Establishment so that we can preserve some of the principles that made this the greatest Nation on earth.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee about some of the detailed matters that are not reflected in the bill or the report. For instance, last year the Army discussed the matter of stockpiling cotton. At that time we had a very short crop and it was with great difficulty that we prevailed upon the Army not to attempt to stockpile cotton from the 9,500,000 bales that were grown last year. This year we have an exceedingly large crop and it occurs to me this would be an excellent time, if the Army cared to stockpile cotton, to do so. I wonder if the gentleman can tell us anything about the intention of the Army in this respect.

Mr. MAHON. I should like to say to the gentleman from Texas that the question of cotton utilization arose during the testimony of General Feldman, Quartermaster General of the Army, as to what should be done about making sure that there is adequate availability of cotton for the Armed Forces. There

are funds in the Quartermaster's appropriation to form a duck and webbing pool.

Mr. FOAGE. That is a pool of fabricated goods. That is not stockpiling the baled cotton.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. I should like to read a statement prepared by the Quartermaster General on the 16th of July, this year:

Experience during World War II indicated the necessity of establishing a single stock of certain duck and webbing items for the armed services to be used in the manufacture of truck cover, tarpaulins, tents, cartridge belts, parachute harness, and many other items.

The normal production capacity of the duck and webbing industry for the types used by the armed services is not sufficient to meet the military demands in an emergency. Therefore, the Munitions Board has approved and directed the establishment of a duck and webbing pool.

The establishment of this pool will:

(a) Eliminate competition between the services and between contractors who manufacture items requiring these materials.

(b) Provide a single stock which will be large enough to satisfy emergency needs.

(c) Provide a method of obtaining a greater percentage of production allocation to military orders by presenting consolidated requirements for the Defense Department.

(d) Provide more orderly scheduling of production in order to obtain maximum results.

(e) Provide a secondary saving in transportation cost through shipment in carload lots.

(f) Provide a close control of allocation of critical chemicals needed by manufacturers through over-all scheduling of finished requirements.

(g) Provide a centralized control for the allocation of existing stocks on an equitable basis between the services according to priority of need.

The estimate submitted is to provide a 6 months operating level for the Department of Defense on the following basis, all of which is included in the Army fiscal year 1952 budget estimates:

Army	\$177,000,000
Navy	35,400,000
Air Force	88,500,000

The estimated stock levels are based on anticipated requirements of the three Departments during the mobilization period and through the operation of a revolving fund will enable manufacturers to establish a stabilized production schedule.

I do not believe that actually answers the problem raised by the gentleman, but it does directly relate to it. In view of the fact that the estimates indicate we may have a 17,000,000-bale crop, it would appear there will be a surplus of cotton and now would be a good time for the Army to stockpile cotton within certain reasonable limits.

This would have to be done by the Army or by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. POAGE. The Department of Agriculture has no funds with which to carry on these stockpiling operations. I understand that there are funds in this bill that can be used for stockpiling operations; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The stockpiling program, generally speaking, is not in this bill. That comes under the independent offices appropriation bill where we stockpile critical materials. As to whether the language in the pending bill could

be interpreted in such a way as to permit the stockpiling of raw cotton, I would have to confer with the attorneys for the Department of Defense. I am not able to answer that question at the moment.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman draws a distinction between stockpiling to be sure that the national economy has the commodity in existence in case of war, and stockpiling to meet the future needs of the armed services. The armed services do have the authority under this bill to buy the things that they will need.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Which will probably include not the raw cotton but the fabrics that the gentleman has discussed.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. The Quartermaster General has for some time been discussing the possibility of making large purchases of cotton goods, the very goods the gentleman mentioned, and certain other goods, too, shirting, and that sort of thing, but those purchases have not materialized over a long period of months. I know the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, is as familiar as I am with the situation that exists in the cotton market today. I wonder if the gentleman might not feel it appropriate as chairman of this subcommittee to call the attention of the military authorities to the fact that now we have the largest potential supply of cotton that we have had in many years, and that now—not next winter, not after the first of the year, but now during the marketing season, if the Army will go into the market now and place their orders for these goods, the military will be able to buy at a lower cost than they can hope to buy at any other time, and at the same time, they will give a stability to the market which will be desirable from every standpoint.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to say that I think the gentleman's suggestion is a good one and I shall be glad to cooperate with the gentleman and take the matter up with the proper officials of the Department of Defense.

Mr. POAGE. Well, I do not want the gentleman to cooperate with me because I do not even know these people. They will not bother with me, but he is the chairman of the committee that holds the money bags. They will be interested in him, they will listen to him, and if he will make a suggestion, it will materialize and get results.

Mr. MAHON. I shall gladly seek an audience with appropriate officials particularly as I represent perhaps the largest cotton-producing congressional district in the United States. I think the suggestion that the gentleman has made is a good one, and we will follow through on this course.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to congratulate the gentleman and the other gentleman from the South. You are always on the ball, and I hope the Army will get all the cotton it needs and take care of your crop.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I received this circular through the mail from an Ohio concern. It shows the picture of Nikolai Lenin, with a quotation from him—and this is a direct quotation—"We shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction." Now, frankly, the way the Communists have worked in this country for the past few years, you know they are encouraging wasteful expenditures. Obviously they are going to keep up this turmoil indefinitely and make us spend as much money as possible. And, we are going to spend it. We have got to spend it. As long as our politicians, who are in top positions, fumble in these international conferences, we are going to be compelled to do what we are doing here today. But, while we are spending this money, unless we spend it wisely, we are just a bunch of suckers. Now here we are appropriating \$56,062,000,000, and according to the testimony of a member of this appropriation subcommittee, there are seven men and only two staff members dealing with an appropriation of \$56,062,000,000. All the members of this subcommittee are fine, upstanding gentlemen. They are businessmen, lawyers, they are capable, and I know they are thoroughly competent and endeavoring to do a good job. I know the two men they have employed are capable men. But how in the world can you expect nine persons to wrestle with an appropriation of \$56,062,000,000 and come up with the right answer?

One of the members of the subcommittee said that on every occasion when they had members of the military before them at least 10 to 17, members of the military would appear before them to request appropriations.

I want to congratulate the chairman on the fine job he has done. I have no criticism of him. I have no fault to find with his committee. The fault I find is with the Congress of the United States, that it does not provide the proper committees of this House with the funds to carry on the kind of investigations that should be carried on or to check the expenditures as they should be checked.

When the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was organized it was made up of 14 committees that were merged. Their job was to check all the expenditures. What in the world do you expect when they are not provided with the tool to work with? For example, a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures went to Detroit the other day. We were in Detroit for 2 days. We sat at least 10 hours each day. We have a very limited staff. We merely scratched the surface, but we found plenty of irregularities in connection with the letting of Government contracts.

Several weeks ago, a special subcommittee of Congress met in Detroit to look

at the books. We were checking into the business of the Army's tank-automotive center. As a direct result of our investigation, the man in charge has been removed from office.

I refer to this case because it points up dramatically just what is wrong with our National Government today. The head man here was a graduate of West Point. He had been on the same assignment for 4 years. When he was questioned on the witness stand, he admitted that he had been a guest of a contractor in Washington 6 weeks before. He told us he had used Government materials to build two small sailboats. On one occasion, he used an Army truck and its crew to ship trees from Detroit to Maryland. When we asked him why he accepted the hotel accommodation, the officer said, and I quote him: "I couldn't do business without accepting hospitality."

Is it any wonder that youngsters take money to throw basketball games when men in high positions reason this way?

We discovered in Detroit that a business outfit about the size of a small garage managed to charge up \$200,000 for gifts, entertainment, and sales expenses on a Government contract. Certainly, no responsible Government official ever went down to look at the place. If anybody had taken a look, he would have blushed redder than a ripe tomato.

If you think these things were bad, what about this? We found here in Detroit that Uncle Sam had handed out another defense contract to a company that was simply subcontracting all its work to other people. It was acting as a kind of job broker, at the taxpayers' expense.

These things do not just happen by accident. They are the direct result of negligence, indifference or active connivance.

Do not think for a minute that these situations are confined to Detroit or Washington. Within the next few weeks the House of Representatives is going to check up elsewhere. In the third internal-revenue district of New York there have been reports of gross irregularities. Several deputy collectors have been involved in charges of fraud. We have had similar stories in Boston and California.

Within the past few weeks the collector for St. Louis resigned under fire and is now under grand-jury investigation. No one knows how far these probes may reach into the whole background of our industrial community.

Whatever their outcome, they point to the need for a new set of ethical standards in our Government. Ethics and morality have sunk to the lowest level in years, at precisely the moment when they should be at the highest.

I say this because today we are spending billions of dollars of taxpayers' funds. Some of it is simply being thrown down the drain. My office in Washington receives enough Government hand-outs, magazines, publications, and other materials to heat up the Capitol. We have "information specialists" in every department. Their job is to say in 10 words what should be said in 3. In 1 year's time the Pentagon Defense De-

partment and Armed Services Office have added 200 of these paid propagandists to the payroll. We now spend almost \$2,500,000 every year for these folks. I say that most of this is money squandered.

And this is just a drop in the bucket. A few weeks ago I reported that the Army has bought a total of 68,000,000 can openers since the beginning of the Korean war. At the moment we have approximately one and a half million men in the Army. Nobody has talked about more than 3,500,000 men for some years to come. When you divide up the number of can openers by the biggest Army figure we now have, it means about 20 can openers per man.

The same Army folks have bought more than 4,500,000 belts and 11,753,000 pairs of boots. They have enough replacements to last until they rot away.

Do not get the idea that this sort of thing is confined to the Army. Not by any means. In January of this year, our Department of Agriculture was selling surplus butter to Italy at a nice bargain price of 15 cents per pound. At these prices, Italy bought 5,500,000 pounds—probably using our money to do it, too. But at the same time that we were selling this butter, our Army Quartermaster was buying 5,000,000 pounds of oleomargarine and paying 25½ cents a pound for that.

Down in Washington, one of our investigators discovered that a Government agency had made a slight miscalculation on its needs for loose-leaf binders. It has enough on hand now to meet all its requirements for the next 247 years.

As I see these things, they look like something more than just bad business. They are not simply errors in judgment. When you have one example after another of wasted money; when you encounter case after case of people in Government offices accepting "gifts" from the men they are supposed to be dealing with on a business-like basis; when you find scores of officials leaving their jobs in Washington or in the armed services to accept juicy positions in companies for whom they had done "favors"; something is decidedly rotten and it is not in Denmark.

It is about time we cleaned house in Washington. We have been talking about the "hand-out state" for years. That is exactly what has been happening. Too many people have their hands out, expecting something for doing their duty.

You do not build strong nations out of weak characters. It does not seem possible to us that a country as strong as ours can be destroyed. It did not seem possible to the rulers of Rome that their great civilization could be torn down in a few generations by bands of uncouth barbarians. The historians who have analyzed the fall of Rome tell us that it fell because of internal weaknesses, corruption, easy living, immorality in high places.

The analogy to our own times in America is clear enough. We can manufacture the guns and tanks. But the strength and determination to use them

wisely must be present if we are to move ahead.

Are we a bunch of saps? It is nothing short of insanity not to provide the regular committees of this House with the funds to carry on investigations of expenditures continuously?

I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures. Since January 1 we have had not over a dozen meetings. We have five or six subcommittees. One of them has an appropriation of \$75,000. Another has an appropriation of \$15,000. They are the authorized committees of this House. They are charged with the responsibility of making these investigations.

I am reminded of the time that I read Mark Twain's book entitled "Innocents Abroad." Mark Twain visited ancient Greece. There he saw the finest bridge he had ever seen in all his life, a most substantial bridge. He asked some of the citizens of Athens about this bridge. They said that on the same spot where this bridge had been erected there had been another bridge erected centuries ago. That bridge had collapsed. The king called out the men who had the contract for the erection of that bridge that had collapsed and called the populace out on a certain day, and he beheaded the whole bunch of those contractors. Then within the same hour that he beheaded these contractors he let a contract for the new bridge. You get the point of that story.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. We in this Congress are, in my opinion, very neglectful, we are very careless when we appropriate billions of dollars and then send a committee out years after a crime has been committed to investigate and apprehend the culprits. The time to check expenditures and the time to check on contractors is when the contracts are let. I was employed for some years as a department store executive. We only did a volume of business of about \$16,000,000 a year. We had 106 buyers; we checked every buyer. If at West Point, they had practiced the same thing they do at all other colleges, we would not have about 100 kids up for dismissal for cheating. Just as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] pointed out, when you have a traffic policeman you do not have so many speeders. So when you spend this tremendous sum of taxpayers' money which will total this year at least \$60,000,000,000, I say that we should check on such expenditures. Whose money is this? It is the taxpayers' money. Are we as careless about our own personal funds and our own personal expenditures as with the expenditures of all the taxpayers? When we have a Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that has the authority to subpoena people and the authority to go in and investigate, then we

ought to provide them with the tools to work with. I say to you as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments that we have not functioned, that we are not on the job. I do not mean to imply any criticism of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson]. I think the chairman of this committee is one of the finest Members of the House. I think the personnel of our committee is good, but we do not have the tools to work with. While we are passing this bill, which will pass, I am sure, without a dissenting vote—and we should pass the bill because we need the money for defense purposes, there is no question about it—maybe we will need more and maybe we will spend more in order to get rid of this potential foe—I say while we are passing this bill, we can afford to spend \$2,000,000 and give it to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and tell them to go ahead and do a job. A general of the arsenal in Detroit was fired because he was a cheap chiseler. We had a lineup of these purchasing agents up there before our subcommittee. Every one of them was buying things wholesale. There was a fellow who got contracts and he had the run of the place because he got things wholesale for everybody. One fellow got an ice machine wholesale, another got a television set, and another a radio set. That fellow, as a result of this control and his purchasing influence, was able to get contracts for himself. Now, is that not a holler? Are we elected to spend taxpayers' money foolishly? Or are we here to watch every dollar of the taxpayers' money. It is the responsibility of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to watch these expenditures. I say it is up to the Congress to provide the money.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we must keep our eye on the ball. The very nature of war is waste, extravagance, and destruction, and assuredly, sir, we are in a state of war. It is said that young men die to preserve peace. I say to you that they die because there is no peace. It is said in the report on this bill that the \$56,000,000 is a measure to preserve peace. I say to you that it is here because there is no peace.

There is but one justification for such a measure and that is it will provide and make possible an armed force of combat efficiency and effectiveness sufficient to destroy our enemy. That enemy is the present Russian Government and the pawns that she moves forcibly and dishonorably.

It is quite natural that politicians want to talk about saving money. I, too, am interested in as effectively and honestly administered a program as is possible. The thing, however, that is more interesting to me is the question of the power that this bill makes possible in behalf of our Armed Forces. It must be measured by that criteria and that alone.

During the past few months I have been alarmed at and ashamed of my

country and my Government, the strong, great, and magnificent country that it is, with a good Government which has not placed at the disposal of our commanders in Korea sufficient force and latitude for them to achieve a decisive military victory. I have been ashamed that young men have died to defend this great country and that we have not backed them with a like measure of courage and devotion.

I am not, and no Member of this body is in position to say whether the \$56,000,000,000 provided in this bill is adequate to produce an armed force competent and sufficient to destroy the present Russian Government. If it does not accomplish that end, then it is not an honest and realistic approach to our present challenge.

Mr. Chairman, it is not the amount of money we spend but the effectiveness with which that money produces military strength which matters now. We are not building the armed services for parade purposes nor for bluffing purposes, nor for political or employment purposes. We are attempting to build a force that is sufficient to win the present war, an armed force that will result in the downfall of the present Russian Government, for only under such circumstances can we hope for peace.

I, too, fervently desire peace in this world, but there is no peace, Mr. Chairman. There is present at all times the challenge of war. In my judgment it will be so as long as the present gangsters and hoodlums run Russia and control the pawns throughout the world.

Let us keep our eye on the ball. This is a bill, which if it is worth consideration, will provide and build a fighting armed force. That is the present challenge which this Congress expects this committee to answer. Its effectiveness cannot be measured in the number of men it provides or the number of tanks or ships or airplanes, but in its striking power and its sufficiency to destroy the enemy that engages us in this unfortunate, bloody, and dangerous war. If this measure accomplishes this end, then it is worth many times the fifty-six billions. If it does not, we are being unrealistic and foolish, and perhaps are sacrificing the safety of civilization.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I think the gentleman is aware that when hostilities come and we really get into war you will spend a billion dollars a day in hostilities.

Mr. LYLE. I say to you that hostilities are not going to break out. They are here. Young Americans are dying this day, not to preserve peace, Mr. Chairman, but because there is no peace. The question is: Does this bill make my country strong enough to destroy—and I use that word advisedly—does it make us strong enough to destroy the enemy? If not, it is not sufficient.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman has posed some very sobering questions. A partial answer is that this bill does not provide sufficient funds to make us strong enough to destroy the enemy.

Mr. LYLE. Then it ought to, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. The further observation can be made, however, that the Department of Defense, when this current fiscal year ends, will not have expended all the funds we have made available. The Department will still have in excess of \$50,000,000,000 unexpended on June 30, 1952, of the funds provided here and in previous years. In other words, this is a relatively slow build-up, and the American people might as well know the facts of the situation, as I know the gentleman does. The gentleman from Texas and I desire a most rapid and effective build-up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] has expired.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his forceful address. I would like to ask the gentleman, in view of his statement that this whole thing is brought about by the gangster government in Moscow, with which I agree, whether or not the gentleman does not think it might be better for us to adopt a foreign policy with regard to these gangster governments, that we do not recognize them as legitimate governments, or governments of the people that they enslave; and that we take steps toward an alliance with the peoples who are enslaved by those governments, and assist them in liberating themselves, overthrowing these gangsters who really are not governments, and who require us to spend not only \$56,000,000,000 but endanger the lives of our youth and the youth of the world.

Mr. LYLE. Let me say to the gentleman that is a bigger question than I would like to answer "Yes" or "No." Certainly I think it has a great deal of merit.

Let there be no mistake, Mr. Chairman, Americans desire peace but they are not so foolish as to believe it exists. They would like to be friendly with the good people of Russia and her satellites but they detest the murderous gangsters who enslave those good people under the guise of a government. We are tired of pretense and diplomatic doubletalk. We do not expect to live under the threat of war for a generation or two and to be led by the nose up and down by the whims of Stalin or any other dictator. We are tired of their lying and cheating, their blowing hot and cold. Whether we like it or not, it is our responsibility to bring peace to the world and we are convinced it cannot be done with timidity and sweet talk. The challenge of today demands an armed force of such

power that it can destroy our enemy. It appears foolish to me to sit by for generations hoping that it will destroy itself.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who just preceded me, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], has raised a serious question, and I think properly so. Maybe I can give him at least part of the answer.

The reason there is no victory yet, and may never be, in Korea, is not due to the lack of the guts or will to fight of the men who are on the ground and in the air and on the sea. You have received and I have received uncounted numbers of letters from these men whose very hearts have been breaking because in what they call a "yo-yo" war they have not been given a chance to go ahead and do the job that they knew they are capable of doing; because the conduct of this war is different from any other; it has been controlled by what have been called agreed politico-military directives.

Let me call your attention to the words of General Vandenberg in the hearings on page 10 where he says this one thing: "Or an aggressive enemy will destroy it on the ground where it is most vulnerable."

He is talking there about his Air Force in war. The Air Force in Korea as yet has not been permitted to destroy the enemy air force where it is most vulnerable, as he says here, on the ground. On another occasion he referred to it this way, in substance: "It is easier to kill the birds in the nest than when they are on the wing."

Those are among the things that are confusing and puzzling to us as we look back upon the past year of the war in Korea. Men like to know what they are fighting for. When you and I were in combat in war the one thing we were fighting for then was to win the war and bring victory. But somehow or other this does not seem to be now the prevailing goal in Korea. It is a very puzzling situation.

We cannot prepare combat troops or bring victory just with dollars; the mere appropriation of \$56,000,000,000 is not going to win the war or give our soldiers thorough combat training, tough training.

Prior to the outset of the Korean war the training that the men who were going into service received was not the hard type of training that you and I have undergone. Prior to Korea there was not any apparent immediate need for that type of tough training. They were trained as internal police forces only. We have been told, however, by the men who are directing the military training of these men today that they are being given hard, realistic training that will make them not only better fighting men and better able to carry the battle to the enemy. They will be more able to properly take care of themselves out on the battlefield.

Dollars will not do that; there has got to be more than mere dollars. You will find that there is a provision in the bill not only for the training of the

men, but also it provides for the equipment that these men will be trained to handle. It is not going to do any good to bring into the Armed Forces a large amount of men if you do not have the equipment available for that training; that would be a waste of manpower. It must be a realistic program.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. The gentleman and I agree that there is only one thing important in this bill and that is combat efficiency and effectiveness.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Right, absolutely right. In this bill huge sums are provided for a mobilization reserve of matériel. In other words, we are getting equipment ready to go when and if the need for it comes. We are also getting factories tooled up, ready to turn out equipment at a later date. You are right, unless we do have combat efficiency, providing equipment is futile. Equipment and training in its use give the young Americans a chance to bring victory to us. We have got to have that objective of combat efficiency in mind. I am glad the gentleman brought up that point. It is something all of us and particularly our military leaders, should think about seriously, not only today but tomorrow and in the future.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are obliged to watch the United Nations action most carefully after we have discovered that the approval of the Charter by the Senate has had the effect of setting aside our State laws. Under the same formula, the Constitution of the United States can be changed by a convention of the United Nations by merely having two-thirds of the Senators present and voting to approve the convention. Forty-nine Senators constitute a quorum, and with this quorum present, if 33 Senators voted for the United Nations law—a convention—it would become the supreme law of this Republic.

What is the complexion of this United Nations? Is it striving to prevent the spread of communism or is it actually at work to build communism? The controlled populations of those members of the United Nations who are actually Communists outnumber the populations of those countries actually opposed to communism. Even in those nations like France and England and many other countries, there is a large section of the population favorable to communism. The conclusion is inescapable, that as to the number of people represented in the United Nations the great majority favor the principles of state ownership as against private enterprise.

When this United Nations organization was set up, who was the General Secretary; who framed the provisions? A Communist was Secretary and worked 19 days with the committee framing the Charter. It would not be a difficult matter to obtain the names of those assisting this Secretary. Without seeing the names, I can assure anyone that there were many on that committee who, if

not Communists, failed to stand up for the principles of this Republic. Lincoln once cataloged men of this stamp when he said:

To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men.

When I see conventions headed toward this country for approval by the Senate, such as the Genocide Convention which seeks to destroy our judicial system and make every citizen's life and liberty subservient to the judicial authority and procedure of the United Nations, I deem it my duty to protest. If it is the desire of communism to destroy this Republic, and I think that is the purpose, it seems that the passage of the Genocide Convention will actually accomplish by indirection what the avowed Communists intend by direct action.

Where an organization like the United Nations is composed of representatives representing a population greater than the opposing populations, it should serve notice on every citizen of this country to scrutinize carefully any proposition on which the United Nations attempts to have passed in this country. Is the administration aware of this situation? I regard President Truman as a true American, but can it be that he has been taken in by the adroitness of the Communist influence in the State Department? Can it be that he is fighting the spread of Russian communism and at the same time condoning the communistic pronouncements emanating from the United Nations?

If this country is doomed to embrace communism, what difference does it make whether Russia accomplishes this purpose or the United Nations gets the credit? The people of this country will defend this Republic—they will defend our institutions and preserve the greatest example of liberty the world has ever seen if they are aware of what is going on. When I became a Member of this Congress I held up my right hand and said:

I, USHER L. BURDICK, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about enter. So help me God.

I meant just what I said in that oath.

By the population complexion of the United Nations; from the fact that one of its conventions has already set aside and annulled the State law of one of our States and will annul other laws as soon as the question is raised judicially; from the fact that the United Nations is attempting to put over the genocide convention and make it the supreme law of this land, destroying our judicial jurisdiction and procedure to protect the public and the accused; their insatiable attitude to meddle with our social and economic life and reduce this Republic to a position of one state among many and destroy the sovereign power of the United States; their demands that laws in all states must conform to the pattern set by the United Nations and by conven-

tions approved by the Senate reach out into the minutest affairs of local self-government, lead me to believe that the United Nations is an enemy of this Republic and I will regard it as such under that oath. I have not reached this conclusion without mature reflection. I have been fair enough to set forth the basis of my belief. If there is anyone in this House who can dispute the basic facts of my statement, he is at liberty to rise now and do so.

The United Nations has never made an out-and-out stand against Soviet communism. Its action has been nothing but a compromise from the first day of its sessions to this hour. When Red China entered the Korean war it was a clear act of aggression that all thinking people admitted, yet it took the United Nations several days, under a lengthy debate, to say that this act was an act of aggression.

Our representative, Warren Austin, was asked, "What has been the outstanding accomplishment of the United Nations for peace?" He promptly responded by saying that the resolution branding Red China as an aggressor was the greatest accomplishment. Now, is not that something? Everyone, even the Red Chinese themselves, knew it was aggression, but it took this august United Nations many days and much debate to decide this one simple thing. The reason for that action was due to the fact that representatives in the United Nations have more Communist populations to represent than those who support capitalism. This organization will always remain a compromise body, because there are too many Communists to pacify.

The Korean stalemate is another example of compromise—we can fight just so much but not too much. We have India to satisfy; we have too many more Communist-dominated countries to satisfy. We cannot wade in and end the war. We can gain no complete victory unless we can shoot down our enemies wherever we find them—but the Communists will not agree to this, so there we are.

It would mean more to the world in stopping the spread of communism if we had two member nations united on stopping it or even ourselves freed from the dead weight of other nations and not try to interfere with local laws of every nation and every state of a nation. Yet we have 60 half-hearted nations trying to stop a thing that the majority believe in themselves. If Red China is finally admitted to the United Nations it will mean 600,000,000 more people backing the Communist idea. It does not require more than a mediocre brain to understand that our playing around with Communists in order to stop communism is self-contradictory. The sooner we pull out of this organization, honey-combed with communism and surrounded by intrigue, the better it will be for not only the United States but the people of the world who seek freedom. We can do more in full faith than we can ever hope to do with a compromised faith which, analyzed, means no faith at all. The first definite and positive thing to do would be to immediately

withdraw recognition from Russia or any other country dealing in war materials with Russia.

We should prepare ourselves for defensive warfare and be in readiness to go to the relief of members of the Atlantic Pact where attacked, but under the pact itself we have no business in Western Europe, for no one has been attacked by Russia since World War II or a period of over 6 years.

The proposed appropriation of \$8,500,000 for Western Europe is not only unnecessary but another way of spending our substance on a wild-goose chase instead of building our own strength to meet any emergency. If we are not strong, how can we help others?

In spreading communism, Russia will not attack Western Europe for the simple reason that she relies on a less costly program to accomplish the same thing—propaganda, intrigue, and deliberate lies are Russia's ammunition to spread her doctrine. She is arming, not to support her propaganda, but because she is afraid she will, herself, be invaded.

What about the protection of our Pacific bases? If we spend our billions in making ourselves strong in the air and on the sea, Russia, in combination with Red China, has no chance of breaking through and communism cannot spread by military power.

England has already recognized Red China and has used her influence to have us do likewise. Dean Acheson was all set on recommending our recognition of Red China until General MacArthur blew him out of the water. Still the enemies of this Republic are conniving to bring about that recognition. The proposed peace treaty with Japan is a startling example of this intrigue to that recognition. Under the terms of that treaty, the surrender of Formosa is clearly outlined. The terms provide that Japan will have the decision of whether to recognize Red China or Formosa. Japan, emerging from war and occupation, will want to carry on an extensive trade and she has more chance of trade with Red China than she has with Formosa. What will Japan's decision be? Naturally, she will decide for the greatest amount of trade. In other words, Dulles contrived to avoid our being involved in selling out Nationalist China and hid behind the Japanese to accomplish the same purpose.

If we lose Formosa as a friend by being a party to its delivery to Red China, our Pacific chain of defense will be broken and thousands of lives of American boys will be taken to keep Russia from overrunning the Pacific and putting our western defenses back to the Bay of San Francisco. By keeping Formosa in friendly hands the loss of life to preserve our western defenses will, with a powerful air and sea power, be negligible.

It seems our State Department is hell-bent on seeing communism flourish. President Truman is determined to keep Acheson. Acheson is more responsible for the building and meddling of the United Nations than any person living. He is more responsible than any person living for our becoming embroiled in the mess of foreign entanglements in which we find ourselves today. The attitude of the President keeps Acheson at work.

If we must spend all the money and furnish all the men in stopping the military power of Russia and China, why do we not do it unhampered by a United Nations whose controlled populations exceed the number of out-and-out anti-Communists by 67,000,000, and if Red China is admitted to the U. N. the Communist-controlled population represented in the U. N. will stand at 1,318,100,000, while we and our friends will muster a force of 488,500,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And if we adopt and go along with that and you should talk, after it has been adopted, on the floor here as you have today, you would be tried, if they so willed, where Oatis was tried, and you would be put where he is now.

Mr. BURDICK. I would be tried in Russia, because I have always said that Stalin was a murderer. He has killed 7,000,000 of his own people who disagreed with him.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I think the most conservative estimate on this question is that during the past 30 years this regime has murdered over 40,000,000 of their own people.

Mr. BURDICK. I presume you are correct; I did not go back that far.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Did they not kill those people before we recognized their form of government; before we picked them up and made them what they are today?

Mr. BURDICK. Yes. I do not know whether or not it would hurt Stalin's feelings if I call him a murderer, but if I did, under the Genocide Convention that this Nation is asked to adopt I am guilty of an offense and would be tried wherever the U. N. saw fit. Russia would make the complaint. But, when you think of it that in the United Nations today there are more Communist-controlled people represented than anyone else, do you expect to get a clear-cut decision from the United Nations on the Korean war or any other matter of interest to capitalistic countries?

The poet, John G. Holland, has described the men we need now:

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and
ready hands;

Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue,
And damn his treacherous flatteries without
winking;

Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the
fog

In public duty, and in private thinking:
For while the rabble, with their thumb-worn
creeds,

Their large professions and their little deeds,
Mingle in selfish strife, lo! Freedom weeps,
Wrong rules the land, and waiting Justice
sleeps!

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] said there was no peace; that men were dying not to establish peace, but because there was no peace. He has opportunity to correct me if in error. At least, that is my understanding of what he said.

We have no peace, our men are dying because over the years this and the preceding administration—and I do not mean to be political or partisan, but I cannot help it if the facts lead me into a discussion of what has happened—because over the last few years this administration and the preceding one have encouraged and harbored and made use of, in policy-making positions in the executive departments, agents of the Communist governments—Communists such as Nathan Witt, Abt, Lee Pressman, all of whom were Communists, serving Soviet Russia while drawing salaries from the Agriculture Department. Now that is a charge against this and the prior administration. And it is not, it cannot, be honestly denied. Some on this side fought them, exposed them, and for our efforts were charged with disloyalty.

I will go one step further in an effort to be fair about the events which led to the building up of Soviet Russia. We, on the minority side, have never made the fight against that policy—against the Reds in Government—we should have made, though some of us did our best. We at times have been afraid of and have been silenced by advocates of the administration policy, radio commentators, columnists, and paid propagandists because we were fearful of what they said and what they wrote. Moreover, the internationalists in our own ranks have charged us with a lack of charity, narrowness of thought, unwillingness to aid needy nations and peoples.

I have had as much to say as anyone, perhaps more, but I am willing, notwithstanding the efforts I have made over the years, to assume my share of the guilt. Perhaps I might have done more, though I know not what.

It would be funny, it would be amusing, if it were not so humiliating to read or to listen to the debate we have had on this bill. Everyone seems to acknowledge that in the sum carried there are billions which are not needed, billions that are there because of waste and extravagance or because of inefficiency, if you care to put it that way, or because of our own neglect here in Congress to equip ourselves, to determine for ourselves, whether the figures given us by interested parties are accurate or not.

It certainly is humiliating to read in the Record of our own failure, as it is told here from the well of the House, to learn what is needed, to know what we should do. I am at a loss. I do not know what the armed services need. So I must go along, I assume, on the theory that being in the war, and being committed to a policy which I think was wholly unnecessary and which is ruinous, I must nevertheless support it because we are in it. Without my consent, despite my protest and vote, our men have been and are being conscripted

to fight in a war not of our choosing—not in our interest. Being in, I cannot deny the funds which are needed to protect them.

But with that attitude should there not go the determination that from this day on I should not—I do not propose to go any further?

I admire the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and respect his ability. I am sure we all do. I listened to him and I agree with what he said, which was to the effect that Congress should have the means of learning what is or is not needed. But what he said is a bitter indictment of our own negligence, you on that side because you have helped formulate and have supported the policy which has put us into this situation, which you admit threatens war and possible disaster, and we on our side because we have not made a more aggressive fight against your ruinous foreign policy. Why should we not in the days gone by as a party, as a party charged as we are with the responsibility of doing what we can to preserve this Nation, have voted against some of the bills like this one and told the majority to send those bills back to committee, examine again the facts, and then come in with a bill which carried only the money which was actually needed, which would provide no funds for waste, for extravagance, for spending by the armed services, for items which were wholly unnecessary.

Yes, the blame rests upon all of us. I am telling you here and now that from now on, whether you like it or not, or whatever you have to say about me, I intend not only to vote my convictions as I have tried to do but I intend to do my best to block your program to get us into every war whenever some other nation or the U. N. may decide a war should be fought to further the ambition of the representatives of other nations or the interest of other nations. I will not, unprotesting, go along with the futile, unsound, ruinous policies of this administration.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to the debate this morning, the remarks made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and others. These comments seemed to me to point up the feeling of the Members of this House that they have inadequate information about this appropriation.

Yesterday in a colloquy with the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, I inquired as to the number of staff members of this Appropriations Subcommittee on the defense appropriation bill and was informed that approximately 12 investigators worked for 2 months.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I would hardly think there was any such length of time as that with that many people. I would think from all the information I have been able to gather that 1 month and six or seven people would be about right. That was not started until after about the first of May. If it were going to be really effective, it should have been started with the coming in of this Congress—by the first of February.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

This morning I inquired as to the names and the number of investigators for this subcommittee from the clerk of the subcommittee, as well as the Clerk of the House, and the disbursing office. I could not obtain the information. I would suggest to the chairman of this subcommittee that it would be no more than fair to the Members of Congress, and to the people of this country, if he would prepare and insert in the Record during this debate the names of every subcommittee investigator, the amount of salary paid, and the number of days or months that he worked on this appropriation bill, and whether they were borrowed personnel, and from what departments they were borrowed. I would like to ask the chairman at this time whether any borrowed investigators were borrowed from the Defense Department itself.

Mr. MAHON. The 11 investigators, who worked about a couple of months on this bill, among others who have worked on it, were, by and large, borrowed from the FBI, the Treasury, Civil Service, and other branches of the Government. None of them was borrowed from the Department of Defense. They were very high-quality personnel. The number working on the assignment was 11, and any statement to the contrary is unequivocally in error.

Mr. MEADER. Would the gentleman have any objection to submitting a tabulation such as I have requested?

Mr. MAHON. May I make another point. One problem involved and one of the difficulties involved in investigations insofar as assigning investigators permanently, let us say to Army, Navy, or the Air Force budget, is that they are thrown in close association and are with them day in day out, and year in and year out. They establish a sort of entente cordiale. There is a tendency for friendships to grow up and for the investigators to look at problems through the eyes of the military, or through the eyes of whatever establishment is being investigated. This would not involve any willful wrong doing.

Mr. MEADER. Would it not be more likely for the entente cordiale to be established where the personnel is borrowed than where they are hired by and under the control of the committee?

Mr. MAHON. I would say that the danger is both ways. It is one of those problems that you always have. I will be glad to supply the gentleman with what information is available in the office of the Committee on Appropria-

tions. I do not have it at hand at the moment with respect to personnel.

Mr. MEADER. Will the gentleman insert this information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that other Members of the House and the public generally will have an idea of the help that this committee had?

Mr. MAHON. The investigators of the Committee on Appropriations come under the jurisdiction of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the committee, and it is through his office that they are employed. I believe it would be more proper if the gentleman made the request of him rather than of me. He has the records and the responsibility in the matter.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to a matter which illustrates how necessary it is that we have the details. It is described in an article in the Detroit News of July 12, 1951. I will ask permission in the House to insert this article in the Record in its entirety. It deals with a trip taken by 20 European editors to visit Detroit war plants. The trip turned out to be absolutely worthless, if not actually detrimental, to the interests of the United States.

The article is as follows:

RED TAPE PUTS CRIMP IN EUROPEANS' VISIT—JOURNALISTS COMPLAIN THEY DID NOT SEE PRODUCTION IN "ARSENAL OF DEMOCRACY"

(By John J. Najdich)

Twenty European journalists and radio commentators, representing American allies in the North Atlantic Treaty, left Detroit today still not convinced the United States is serious in its defense-rearming program.

The failure to convince them was attributed to the Defense Department, which brought the visitors for the express purpose of showing them American firepower and military production centers and then disappointed them.

Before coming to Detroit, the 20 were taken to Quantico Marine Base, Va.; Fort Benning, Ga., and Eglin Air Force Base, Fla. They were impressed there by the firepower of American forces and then were brought to Detroit to see where the firepower was produced.

Instead the group was taken on a tour of civilian-car production centers, historical sights, the All-Star ball game, and a round of dinners, lunches, and cocktail parties.

DUTCHMAN COMMENTS

The visitors became so disgusted at one point of the Detroit trip that only five of the group showed up at one civilian plant.

Finally, on Wednesday, the third day of their tour, after the Europeans protested, the Defense Department escorts took them to the Detroit tank arsenal.

This tour of the tank arsenal did not satisfy the visitors, because, they explained, it was a full-time Government plant and was not the same as a privately owned plant turning out munitions and not peacetime products.

Andries Ekker, political correspondent for Het Parool and De Nieuw Pers in the Netherlands, in a dispatch to his newspapers expressed his disappointment.

WHERE ARE THE BULLETS?

"How can I tell the people of my own country," he said, "that we should be cutting down our own civilian production and lowering our own standard of living, when nowhere did I see the Americans producing for war?"

"We're willing to live up to our obligations, if the Americans can convince us they are likewise willing to live up to theirs. There are still many cars rolling off the lines but not a bullet did I see."

Povl Westphall, editor of the *Berlingske Tidende* in Denmark, explained "We were anxious to come to this country to learn about American efforts. We expected to see defense production, but we got a surprise." He added, "We have to realize that it will be a long time before it is a reality."

RED TAPE BLAMED

This feeling was contained in the reports from the rest of the visitors.

They were enthusiastic about the sight-seeing tour, declaring that it was the best they could ever hope to take, but would have preferred a business tour.

Local observers could name a dozen, civilian plants within a half-hour drive from the Fort Shelby Hotel, the visitors' headquarters in Detroit, where they could have seen military equipment coming off the lines, if prior clearance had been made.

A State Department escort blamed the Defense Department for failing to permit such a tour and giving proper clearance. The Defense Department said red tape was responsible.

WASHINGTON DECIDES

The Detroit Board of Commerce, which played host to the visitors, tried to take the visitors on a tour of defense-production centers but received no assistance from Washington.

Altogether there were eight Army and Navy officers accompanying the visitors and two State Department officials. In addition, crews of two Government planes were on hand waiting to take them on the next leg of their journey to New York.

In addition to the board of commerce expenses, the Detroit visit cost the Government an estimated \$5,000. The 1-month tour may cost \$50,000.

GERMANS PLEASED

The visitors likewise were disgusted with several of their escorts. One of the escorts went swimming, leaving the journalists under his care to find their own way to the All-Star ball game.

Another escort was inebriated during the entire trip.

The visitors included 11 German journalists. From their standpoint, the tour was successful since the human side of American production was emphasized.

Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege, as a guest of the Detroit Board of Commerce, to participate in one afternoon's activities of this group of European editors in Detroit. It consisted of cruising up and down the Detroit River, which consumed the greater part of a Sunday afternoon. I can personally attest to the accuracy of the article regarding the conduct of some of the escorts for this group of editors. In fact, I am informed that the conduct of some of the escorts was such that the European editors felt it necessary to apologize to their Detroit hosts for the conduct of their escorts from the Department of Defense.

The reason that I have referred to this article is because this is one concrete instance of the expenditure of public funds by the Department of Defense concerning which I would like to have a great deal more information.

I was informed that this visit of the 20 European editors, in which they toured various areas of the United States, was only one of six such junkets arranged by the Public Relations Office of the Depart-

ment of Defense. I would like to know how much money these—and similar junkets—cost the taxpayers. I would like to know more details about the purpose of such activities. Certainly if the purpose of the particular tour referred to in the Detroit news article was to gain good will for the United States and to convince these foreign editors that the United States was making an all-out effort for rearmament, the Detroit visit was a total loss. The reason it was a total loss was because the Washington agencies failed to obtain clearance for these editors to visit any defense plants in Detroit, although the necessity of doing so had been called to their attention long in advance of the trip to Detroit.

If this visit was solely for the purpose of providing an interesting tour for a certain selected group of foreigners, I question the propriety of financing such a tour at the expense of the American taxpayer. I doubt that there are very many Americans who would not like to make a tour of Europe or other parts of the world, but it is wholly improper to satisfy such desires out of public funds. There must be a definite and palpable relation to the interests of the United States Government before such travel can be justified as a public expenditure.

There is another aspect of the matter which is of considerable interest to me. Since this program appears to have emanated from the Public Relations Office of the Department of Defense, I am interested in whether or not public funds in this instance, or in other similar instances, will be used to further political and ideological objectives of the executive branch of the Government.

I wonder whether the media of communication, the press, the radio and television, are being granted favors out of funds appropriated for military purposes with the objectives of creating a sympathetic acceptance for the philosophy of those whose sole duty is to carry out policies enacted by the Congress.

These and other questions concerning this single episode indicate how important it is that the committees of Congress should have investigators capable of finding out the truth about these public activities.

Probably the entertainment and travel provided at the expense of the Defense Department is a comparatively insignificant item when viewed in the perspective of total appropriations of \$56,000,000,000. However, the underlying principle is applicable to the entire appropriation; namely, that the budget request should be challenged and screened independently by the Congress. The Congress should be able, in fact, to defend before the American people the amounts they have authorized to be spent in the appropriation bills.

I think it is a shame that the debate on this \$56,000,000,000 appropriation bill will end without the true facts appearing in the Record with respect to the staff this appropriations subcommittee has had at its disposal. The chairman of the subcommittee claimed there were 11 or 12 investigators who worked there about 2 months. An informal inquiry

this morning indicated that there were 15 such investigators. The ranking minority member the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has stated that there are only six or seven investigators who worked about 1 month. I think the true facts should be in the Record for the benefit of the Congress and the American people.

Whatever figure is right, however, it seems to me that the staff of this appropriations subcommittee is wholly inadequate. I repeat the charge I made yesterday that the responsibility for the weakness of the Congress, the weakness of its committees because of their inability to master the facts of the problems with which they deal, is solely and exclusively the responsibility of the majority leadership of this House.

The Clerk read as follows:

RETIRED PAY

For retired pay and retirement pay, as authorized by law, of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force, including the reserve components thereof; and retainer pay for personnel of the inactive Fleet Reserve; \$345,000,000.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Page 4, line 22, before the period at the end thereof insert a colon and the following new matter: "Provided, That no part of such sum shall be used to pay the retired or retirement pay of any member of the regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force who is retired after the date of enactment of this act, unless such member is retired because of (1) being unfit to perform the duties of his office, rank, grade, or rating by reason of a physical disability incurred in line of duty, or (2) achieving the age at which retirement is required by law."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I have offered is designed to stop the retirement pay of members of the Armed Forces for other than physical disability or statutory age.

You have read in the papers during the past several months about admirals and generals at the age of 47, 49, 50, and 52, who have been retired from the armed services, because they have not been selected for promotion, or they disagree with the policy of their superiors. Upon retirement they generally go into civilian life and accept employment with private industry at a lucrative salary.

The situation is simply this: The American taxpayer spends \$30,000 educating the average officer of the Armed Forces, and when he retires he retires generally on three-quarters pay. Someone has to take his place, so instead of one man filling that job there are two men filling the job; one on active duty and the other retired. Therefore, the cost of that is increased by adding the retired pay to that of the person on active duty.

My amendment simply means that no portion of this appropriation can be spent to pay retirement benefits to any officer or enlisted man who retires from the armed services for reasons other than physical disability or age. You

will save a million dollars a year by this amendment and you will not impair the efficiency of our Armed Forces. In fact, you will increase their efficiency by keeping these admirals, generals, and others on active duty for the duration of this emergency.

During the 8 months beginning June 25, 1950, up until March 1 of this year, 1,914 officers and enlisted men were retired for reasons other than physical disability. The additional cost to the American taxpayer for that 8 months was \$605,000. For a period of a year,

the cost of these retirements will approximate a million dollars.

At this point, I wish to make a part of my remarks a chart showing the number of officers and enlisted men retired during the first 8 months of the Korean war and the cost to the taxpayers:

Officers and enlisted men retired from armed services on statutory age and length of service, June 25, 1950–Mar. 1, 1951

Pay grade	Rank	Army	Navy	Marines	Air Force	Active-duty pay per month	Retired pay per month	Total of both active-duty and retired pay	Total	Total active-duty pay	Total retired pay
08	Rear admiral ¹		12		2	\$954.75	\$716.06	\$1,670.81	24	\$22,914.00	\$17,185.44
	Major general	10									
07	Rear admiral ²		1		1	\$26.50	619.88	1,446.38	31	25,621.50	19,216.28
	Brigadier general	27			2						
06	Captain		131			698.25	523.98	1,222.23	385	268,826.25	201,732.30
	Colonel	229			20						
05	Commander		11		5	584.25	438.19	1,022.44	129	75,368.25	56,526.51
	Lieutenant colonel	111			2						
04	Lieutenant commander		24		5	513.00	384.75	897.75	139	71,309.00	53,480.25
	Major	87			6						
03	Lieutenant		4		22	411.75	331.31	743.06	54	22,234.50	17,890.74
	Captain	49			3						
02	Lieutenant (junior grade)		1			349.13	261.85	610.98	14	4,887.82	3,665.90
	First lieutenant	12			1						
01	Ensign					313.50	235.13	548.63	3	940.50	705.39
	Second lieutenant	3									
W4 and 3	Commissioned warrant	12	1	14	1	465.60	349.20	814.80	28	13,036.80	9,777.60
W2 and 1	Warrant	13		1	12	349.20	261.90	611.10	26	9,079.20	6,809.40
E7	Chief petty officer		70			294.00	220.50	514.50	705	207,270.00	155,452.50
	Master sergeant	315		39	281						
E6	Petty officer, first-class		3			249.90	187.89	437.79	139	34,736.10	26,116.71
	Sergeant, first-class	92		6	38						
E5	Petty officer, second-class		2			227.85	170.89	398.74	156	35,544.60	26,658.84
	Sergeant	90		6	60						
E4	Petty officer, third-class		1			191.10	143.33	334.43	44	8,408.40	6,306.52
	Corporal	38		4	1						
E3	Seaman					147.00	110.25	257.25	20	2,940.00	2,205.00
	Private, first-class	17		1	2						
E2	Seaman					120.00	90.00	210.00	17	2,040.00	1,530.00
	Private	17									
E1	Seaman										
	Private										
	Total					5,951.93	5,045.11	11,740.89	1,914	805,156.92	605,247.38

¹ Upper half.

² Lower half.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. While I am in great sympathy with the gentleman's amendment, I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks this amendment would apply to those under retirement for years of service, regardless of age.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. You mean retired for 30 years of service?

Mr. KEARNEY. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. It definitely will. It will make it mandatory that they stay in the service for the duration of the present emergency.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will approve this amendment.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the gentleman tell the committee exactly what his amendment would do?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I can use an illustration. For instance, a general has 30 years of service and he applies for retirement. He may be at the age of 47. If his application for retirement is accepted, he will be retired on three-quarters pay. My amendment will not permit the services to spend any money toward the retirement pay of that individual. Therefore, it is assumed that the services will not retire the gentleman who makes application on account of 30 years of service.

Mr. PATTERSON. That would be exclusive of physical disability?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That would be exclusive of physical disability. If he has reached the statutory retirement age of 64, he must retire.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The Congress is not at all hesitant about extending the periods of service for those draftees whom it has taken into service?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Certainly not. We violated our contract with the enlisted man when we extended his enlistment on two different occasions for a period of 12 months.

Mr. DONDERO. And the reservists as well.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Does not the President at the present time have discretion as to whether or not he will authorize the retirement of an officer after 30 years of service?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Definitely so. Congress passed the bill several weeks ago giving to the Secretary of the Navy the right to stop certain retirements if he wished to, but it appears that neither the Secretary nor the President are keeping these men who are trained and experienced in the service so that the American people can receive benefit from their efforts during the present emergency.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Would the gentleman's amendment provide for these officers who have not been selected for promotion and thus wish to retire, and also that they become extra numbers in grade so that it will not impede the orderly flow of promotions?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. My amendment provides that these officers shall be carried as extra numbers and, therefore, their retention on active duty will not impede the usual flow of promotions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may proceed for two additional minutes that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman's amendment only hits future retirements.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is right; it does not affect in any way, shape, or form any of the benefits received by those who have retired prior to this bill becoming a law. It means that effective that date officers and enlisted men cannot be retired for reasons other than physical disability or statutory age requirement.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Is there a limitation as to how long this prohibition shall remain in operation?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. For the duration of the emergency.

Mr. DEVEREUX. For the duration of the emergency as we understand it to be.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. If this amendment is adopted we will follow the same practice during this emergency that we followed during World Wars I and II.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, this could be applicable only to the funds provided in this bill anyway.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is understood, and we would have to renew this limitation on the expenditure of funds for the next fiscal year.

The retirement list contains hundreds of duly qualified and experienced personnel whose services could be utilized at small cost to the Government. Yet the Army has recalled to active duty only 404 retired personnel, the Navy and Marine Corps 96, and the Air Force only 6. Meanwhile, of the 1,975 retired for other than physical reasons or on age, 991 were in the Army, 452 Navy and Marine Corps, and 532 in the Air Force.

It should be kept in mind that the retirement of military personnel often requires the calling up of Reserves to fill such vacancies. In many instances retirement has been mandatory because an officer failed to be selected for promotion. For example, a Navy captain was forced to retire recently at the age of 51 because he failed to be selected for promotion to rear admiral. His pay at the time of retirement was \$860.25 monthly and after being retired he received \$523.68 as his retirement pay each month, and will continue to receive that sum for the rest of his life.

The Navy captain is a graduate of the United States Naval Academy and his education cost the American taxpayers approximately \$30,000. In addition to the experience he received while in naval service he also had attended several post-graduate schools that added another \$10,000 to the taxpayers bill for his education.

As a replacement for the retired Navy captain, a reserve commander was called from civilian life and added to the Federal payroll with a base pay of \$689.25 monthly. Now we have the retired captain and the reserve commander both on the payroll at a combined monthly salary of \$1,213.23. In other words, before retirement the Navy captain was filling his assignment at a rate of \$860.25 monthly and in a more efficient manner because of his education and experience. Today the filling of his billet has resulted in adding another name to the payroll with the net result that the retirement of the Navy captain is costing the taxpayers an additional \$523.68 monthly. This is only one of many similar instances where the taxpayers' money is being wasted.

On May 14, I called to the attention of the House that from July 1, 1950 to March 1, 1951, 1,914 persons were retired from the Armed Forces for other than physical reasons. I submitted a table showing that the total cost of their services while on active duty amounted to

\$805,156.92 monthly, and that their retirement pay for the 8-month period amounted to \$605,247.38.

If my amendment is adopted, you can readily realize that a saving to the taxpayers will result because duly qualified military personnel will be retained on duty unless retired on physical disability or through achieving the age at which retirement is required by law. In the 8-month period cited the American taxpayers would have been saved the retirement pay of \$605,247.38 if the provisions of my amendment were in effect.

Mr. Chairman, it is recognized that Congress as a whole is conscious of the absolute need for economy, not alone in nonessential Government expenditures, but also in the military budget when reductions can be made without impairing the national defense program.

I feel certain that the adoption of my amendment is in the interest of real economy. At the same time, it will strengthen our national defense by retaining on active duty during the present emergency, experienced and duly qualified personnel of the Armed Forces, whose forced retirement at this time for other than physical reasons or having achieved the age at which retirement is required by law, is proving a costly expenditure to the American taxpayers.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could have an agreement as to time for debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto?

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 4 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] is recognized.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, if the members of the Committee will turn to page 9556 of the proceedings of yesterday, they will find in the center column of that page my discussion of this matter of the retirement of these high-ranking military men with long years of experience. Many of them have just come to the point where they can make a great contribution to our national military effort. I stated yesterday that I felt that the practice should be curtailed sharply until this emergency is over; that these men should be retained in service where we could receive the benefit of their experience and training. As has been said, if we can compel young men from civilian life to serve longer than their contract of enlistment, then these men trained at Government expense can well be retained until the need for their services is over.

This proposed amendment will accomplish exactly the goal that I proposed yesterday; and, naturally, Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I, too, hope that we accept this amendment. It should go further than it does. In the last couple of decades we have

been kind of making a baby out of this Army and Navy and defense force. After 1949 we had 450 generals, that is from brigadiers to full general. I have never taken the trouble to ascertain how many admirals we had in the Navy or how many generals we had in the Air Force and Marine Corps. We have twice as many as we need. If there is any reason why we should retire men at three-quarters pay who are only 48, 49, or 50 years old, I would like to know that reason. Everyone else in the Government service has to be 65 before they can retire.

Mr. Chairman, back in the old Spanish-American War days, as I remember it, we had three admirals. Now we have eight full generals in the Army. I do not know how far we are going with this kind of stuff. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] called attention to the civilian personnel falling all over themselves. It is the generals who are falling all over themselves, not the civilians.

While it may not mean anything, we have to vote for this bill, but we should start thinking and should endeavor to stop this building up, building up, building up of the military in this country. Due to the propaganda they put out and the scare lines they put out, plus everything else they indulge in, they try to make the people of the country afraid, and this situation should stop.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman says we have got to vote for this bill. Does he say that because we have taken on the job of defending the world, and it is a pretty big job? If we would limit this to defending ourselves maybe we would not have to vote for this bill.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I intend to vote for it. I am not voting for any aid to Europe or Asia or anybody else, but we have this \$60,000,000,000 here for our own defense. It is too much, without adding eight or ten billion more for aid to Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I turn to page 7 of the report to read one brief paragraph about retired pay:

The appropriation request for "Retired Pay" in the amount of \$360,000,000 is to provide for pay of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Information before the committee indicated that the appropriation request for fiscal year 1951 was overestimated. More retired personnel are being called back into service, which should reduce the requirements, and in the opinion of the committee more careful scrutiny should be given to requests for retirement of persons who have not reached the legal age limit for retirement. On the basis of these facts and on past experience the committee recommends a reduction of \$15,000,000 in this request, leaving for appropriation \$345,000,000.

In other words, the committee has already taken action that seems appropriate in order to discourage retirement of military personnel. There is a tendency that is rampant in this country for

people to shift the responsibility and duty which is theirs to somebody else, but I think we should each stand on our own two feet and do that which we are called upon to do as Representatives of the people.

The Committee on Armed Services of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a member has jurisdiction over legislation of this type. His proposal is a legislative provision, and I understand exhaustive hearings are being held by his committee. With this bill, as big as it is, it seems to me that this is not the time to have a shot gun amendment of this kind.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. I would like to remind the gentleman from Texas that in the last Congress the Committee on Armed Services for the first time since 1908 revised the provisions of law with reference to pay and retirement. It was based upon a recommendation of the report of the Hook Commission which went into the matter exhaustively for a period of over 18 months. We wrote a bill and brought it in here. It was recommitted. We rewrote it to satisfy the Congress, and it was passed. All elements were considered. I understand that complaint was raised because men were retired before the statutory age based on physical disability. That is based on a percentage of 2½ percent times the years of service. The gentleman from Massachusetts said they retired at 75 percent. That is no longer correct. He can only get 50 percent with 20 years of service. Physical disability retirement is now based on a percentage as graded by the Veterans' Administration. I insist that this is not the time or the manner to change a law that was so carefully considered by a commission and the Congress.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman for his sound and helpful suggestions. It would be utterly ridiculous, without adequate hearings, to change the law of the land. I like to feel that the military leaders who have retired have done so for good and sufficient reasons and that if we should become involved in a global war they would gladly return to the uniform. Of course, American mothers would not want their sons to fight under the leadership of an officer who was not willing to give his best energies to the Government and this country in time of extreme emergency. After all, the laws which Congress has passed make retirement under certain circumstances perfectly legal.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Did the gentleman approve this policy in World War I and World War II?

Mr. MAHON. I am not saying what we did in World War II or World War I. I say that today we do not want to write legislation without adequate consideration which belongs to his commit-

tee. Let the gentleman take action on the matter in his own committee and bring out appropriate legislation.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as to whether we did this in World War I, every man who served in World War I under the law was entitled to retire with 75 percent if he had as much as 20 years' service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VAN ZANDT) there were—ayes 47, noes 41.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAHON and Mr. VAN ZANDT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 71.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXPEDITING PRODUCTION

To enable the Secretary of the Army, without reference to section 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and to section 1136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (except provisions thereof relating to title approval), to expedite the production of equipment and supplies for the Army for emergency national defense purposes, including all of the objects and purposes specified under each of the appropriations available to the Department of the Army during the current fiscal year, for procurement or production of equipment or supplies, for erection of structures, or for acquisition of land; the furnishing of Government-owned facilities at privately owned plants; the procurement and training of civilian personnel in connection with the production of equipment and material and the use and operation thereof; and for any other purposes which in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army are desirable in expediting production for military purposes, \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, against the language beginning in line 4 of page 7, and ending in line 6, and reading as follows: "and for any other purposes which in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army are desirable in expediting production for military purposes."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to say that the language is subject to a point of order. I doubt, however, that the language is necessary. I have no serious objection to the language being stricken from the bill, but I do not want to concede that the language is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman refer the Chair to any specific law with reference to this language?

Mr. MAHON. I do not have the language of the basic legislation before me, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore is subject

to the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For expenses necessary for equipping, maintaining, operating, and training the Army National Guard, including expenses of camps, airfields, storage facilities, buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, the purchase (not to exceed 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for official use only, and the modification, repair, maintenance, and operation of airplanes; transportation of things; personal services in the National Guard Bureau and services of personnel of the Army National Guard employed as civilians (without regard to their military rank) necessary for the care, maintenance, modification, and repair of materials and equipment, for Federal property and custodial accounting work, and for administrative and such other duties as may be required; medical and hospital treatment of members of the Army National Guard who suffer injury or contract disease in line of duty and other expenses connected therewith as authorized by law; pay at a rate not less than \$2,400 per annum and travel of property and disbursing officers for the United States; travel expenses (other than mileage), at the same rates as authorized by law for Army National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Army National Guard division and regimental commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; attendance of Army National Guard personnel at military service schools; drill pay of the Army National Guard; subsistence for drills of eight or more hours duration in any one calendar day; expenses of temporary duty travel of personnel of the Regular Army in connection with activities of the Army National Guard; procurement and issue to the Army National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of military equipment and supplies, as provided by law, including motor-propelled vehicles and airplanes; and expenses of repair, modification, issue, maintenance and use of supplies, material and equipment, and such property may be furnished from Army stocks without reimbursement subject to recall for Army requirements; \$202,982,000, to remain available until June 30, 1953: *Provided*, That the number of caretakers authorized to be employed for any one unit or pool under the provisions of section 90 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Army.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call to the attention of the committee a matter which I do not think should be overlooked. In the provision of funds for caretakers and administrative assistants for the Army National Guard, we have provided the amount of money requested by the Army and the Bureau of the Budget. But that funds is \$2,900,000 less than the representatives of the National Guard Bureau and the National Guard Association feel is essential for the proper care and supervision of their equipment, and for the various administration requirements of the National Guard. The committee did not put in the additional money which was requested. I asked the Bureau of the Budget 2 weeks ago to provide me with more detailed information on their reasons for eliminating that \$2,900,000 before the bill came to

Congress. Despite the fact that my request was made 2 weeks ago, and despite the assurance that the information would promptly be forthcoming, I do not yet have the information. It is my understanding that the cut was made on the assumption that the National Guard with many of its units and much of its personnel now in Federal service, would require fewer caretakers and administrative assistants. However, the evidence which has been made available to me indicates this is not the case.

The National Guard Association and the National Guard Bureau feel that this cut is too deep and that we shall run into trouble, in that the Guard will not have personnel sufficient to properly look after the costly and essential equipment.

I call this to the attention of the committee because we may be making a mistake in not providing additional funds in this instance.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Is it not also true that at this particular time the National Guard has more officers and men than it has ever had in the history of this country, and these funds are absolutely necessary?

Mr. SIKES. I share the gentleman's feeling in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I have not heretofore taken any time on this bill. As I have listened to the debate today and yesterday the thought kept crossing my mind, Why is it necessary that we add this additional crushing burden on the backs of the American people? What is behind all this appropriation of vast sums of money? Why must we stand here in the well of this House and raise these questions in trying to protect our country and the American people.

The answer comes back: "Because we are trying to contain communism around this world," or "Because we are in fear that we will become engaged in war with Russia."

How did it happen that Russia has become such a formidable power as to threaten the peace of the world? Well, we recognized that Government sometime in 1933 or 1934, but on September 9, 1928, 5 or 6 years before we recognized that Government, then a tottering regime, which gave it prestige and power all over this world. Here is what Pravda, a Russian newspaper, had to say in regard to what Russia and its Communist regime proposed to do; yet in the face of this statement our Government, through the New Deal, was unwise enough to give them official recognition in the family of nations. I quote:

The world-wide nature of our program is not mere talk, but an all-embracing and blood-soaked reality.

Notice "blood-soaked reality."

It cannot be otherwise. Our ultimate aim is world-wide communism, our fighting preparations are for world revolution, for the conquest of power on a world-wide scale

and the establishment of a world proletarian dictatorship.

How can we justify the action we took in the face of a statement like that, giving notice to the civilized world that their program was to destroy every other government on the face of the earth and set up world revolution and world communism?

But that is not all. Stalin had this to say about the same time, and I quote him:

The dictatorship of the proletariat is the most determined and the most ruthless war waged against the bourgeoisie.

That is the free world today.

The proletarian state is an instrument for the suppression of the bourgeoisie.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a revolutionary power based on violence against the bourgeoisie. To put it briefly: The dictatorship of the proletariat is the domination of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, untrammelled by law and based on violence.

Since those statements were uttered, this country and this Government through the Fair Deal Administration has sheltered, shielded, and protected Communists here in our own Government. Communism has been appeased both at home and abroad. We have seen nothing but a policy of appeasement of Russia and her satellites especially since the last World War or what we know as World War II. We all remember and shall never forget Yalta, Tehran and Potsdam. That policy of appeasement by the present administration is present even in the resolution that may come before the House again this afternoon. I refer to the Oatis resolution which is only a mild slap on the wrist of Czechoslovakia for arresting and jailing one of our Associated Press correspondents who was determined to uphold the right of freedom of the press in this country.

That policy of appeasement has simply done nothing but encourage aggression and greater aggression against us and the civilized world. The result is that today we stand here in this House to further burden the American people with another \$56,000,000,000 on top of their already crushing burden of taxation that is sapping the life blood out of our country. In 12 months the House has passed three tax bills which has added \$17,000,000,000 in new taxes on the American taxpayer.

How long can we continue before utter collapse becomes the unhappy fate of our country? And when we go down what other country will remain in this world to stop communism anywhere or stand up for free people?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I congratulate the gentleman for his eloquent words. The gentleman will recall that in the negotiations to recognize Soviet Russia in the fall of 1933 the precise purpose mentioned in the letter of President Roosevelt to the President of Russia was stated as being to permit the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Russia to communicate with one another. Since that time there has been less com-

munication, there has been no communication, whereas before we recognized them there was substantial communication between these peoples.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is correct; I thank him for his contribution. Certain it is that we cannot long remain a solvent government if this program of spending all over the world continues. Collapse and the loss of our heritage of freedom will soon be our tragic fate.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 4, line 22 to correct a printing error. There is some confusion as to the amount. The amount is \$345,000,000. The second set of three figures is set off by a period instead of a comma; in other words, it should read "\$345,000,000."

I ask unanimous consent that the figure be amended to read correctly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, clothing, permanent change of station travel (including expenses of temporary duty between permanent duty stations), and transportation of dependents, as authorized by law, for regular and reserve personnel on active duty (except those on active duty while undergoing reserve training), \$2,456,475,000.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday there was some discussion about the President's yacht, the *Williamsburg*, the Navy vessel that is set aside for the use of the President. A question was raised as to how the food consumed by the President and his guests was procured, and from what funds. I am informed by the Assistant Director of the Budget for the Navy that the President has a separate mess aboard the *Williamsburg*. He buys his food and pays the regular prices, which are the same as those paid for food in the officers' mess for the items desired. This cost of this food is paid from the President's own personal fund.

As far as the expenses of the men and officers on board the *Williamsburg* are concerned, their rations are taken care of just as other naval rations and expenses are taken care of.

There was a question raised as to the expenses for the plane *Independence*. The pay of the crew, the expenses for maintaining and operating the plane comes from Air Force appropriations. As in the case of the *Williamsburg*, some of the incidental expenses are paid from White House funds. However, it is impossible to inform the House as to those items or the amounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT AND RELATED PROCUREMENT

For construction, procurement, and modernization of aircraft and equipment, including ordnance, spare parts, and accessories therefor; expansion of public and not to exceed \$100,000 for expansion of private

plants, including the land necessary therefor, without regard to section 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended, and such land, and interests therein, may be acquired and construction prosecuted thereon prior to approval of title by the Attorney General as required by section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended; procurement and installation of equipment in public or private plants; and departmental salaries necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, \$4,000,000,000, of which \$450,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to correct an error in the printing of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAHON: On page 36, line 15, strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$100,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title VI—General provisions.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: Page 51, add a new section, beginning on line 9, as follows:

"Sec. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the costs of sending or maintaining abroad ground troops in excess of six divisions in implementation of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, it is a truism never better demonstrated than by the experience we have had with this problem of sending troops to implement the North Atlantic Pact Treaty. The truism is that nothing is ever settled until it is settled right.

You will all remember the great debate last winter in which there was fought out in the Senate, in the press, and on the radio, and on every street corner, the constitutional question of who should have the right to declare war, to create the conditions out of which war or peace might arise, and in detail as to whether or not the President, under our constitutional system, had absolute and unlimited power to commit unlimited bodies of troops anywhere in the world at his own sweet will.

The net result, as you will recall, was that long and extensive debate on Senate Resolution 99, in which the Senate, by an overwhelming majority of 69 to 21, declared unequivocally and without limitation or reservation the principle that before troops were sent abroad in any substantial numbers congressional approval should be obtained, and in that same resolution the Senate approved, in effect, the six-division request of the administration.

Now, if this matter had been settled right, I would not be on the floor here today taking your time with this amendment. It was not settled right, Mr.

Chairman, because the President and the Democratic leadership were unwilling to permit that resolution, which passed the Senate, to come before the membership of this House, to be passed by the House, and so to become law. The net effect of it was that the Senate operated with the administration on the assumption that they could deal on a basis of good faith on both sides. The history of this situation indicates very clearly how completely misplaced that assumption was and how completely unfounded was the belief that Congress could rely upon this administration, the State Department, or Defense Department to act in good faith in dealing with the Congress.

When the North Atlantic Pact was before the Senate for ratification, in answer to a question by a Senator, the Secretary of State himself declared emphatically and unreservedly "No" to the question of whether troops would be expected or asked for to implement the preparedness phases of the North Atlantic Pact. Yet, a few days later, a few weeks later, a few months later, troops are sent. The Senate was told of it, and the great debate began as to whether troops might be sent without the authorization and approval of Congress. In the course of the hearings, those very hearings as to how many troops would be sent, the other top-level member of the Truman administration appeared as a witness before the Senate and testified that six divisions were what they wanted; that six divisions were all that were needed to constitute America's contribution to the NATO army. The question was asked how many men were involved in six divisions, and, again, without reservation, unequivocally, the answer was given, 200,000 men.

On the assumption that 200,000 men were involved in 6 divisions, the Senate passed that resolution which was introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs jointly with the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, by an overwhelming majority, and the people by an overwhelming majority, in my judgment, approved the sending of 6 divisions to participate in the build-up of the North Atlantic army.

Lo! and behold, here the other day, again, the Secretary of Defense appeared before a Senate committee, several months after the great debate, after the proposal had become accepted and we were sending 6 divisions of 200,000 men. "How many men are to be abroad by the end of the year?" somebody asked the great Secretary of Defense. "Oh," he said, "400,000." In other words, the division in the mind of the Pentagon in dealing with the Congress and the public is an accordion division to be made small when seeking congressional approval and to be stretched to the supreme limit when the troop ship is on the tide.

So that twice, twice by the very top level members of the administration, Congress has been misled into acceptance of commitments by testimony which proved wholly inaccurate. I say, Mr. Chairman, the time has come, in the exercise of its own sacred trust to the people of America, its trust to safe-

guard the liberties of a free people, for it to take a position that requires it no longer to rely upon the feeble reed of the good faith of an administration whose good faith has proven to be nonexistent.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. The gentleman speaks about 6 divisions. Have we any assurance from the administration or the Department of Defense that those 6 divisions will not be expanded to double in size?

Mr. COUDERT. Only this, I might say to the gentleman from New York, that the division of last February has already been doubled in size, and I think even the Department of Defense would be ashamed to double it again if we adopt this amendment today to reaffirm by law the 6 divisions limitation.

What this amendment will do is all that can be done within the limitations of the rules applying to appropriation bills. It will limit the use of the funds in this bill to maintaining under Article III abroad more than the 6 divisions which the department has asked for. They have not asked for any more. When they come to ask for any more, they are going to come here and ask for them and get authorization from the Congress.

Let me make clear the main premise. This amendment is limited to the application of article 3 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Article 3 deals only with the build-up provisions and the creation of an army in the period short of war. It does not limit whatever the powers of the President under the North Atlantic Pact or his constitutional powers in the event of attack, because in article 5 of the North Atlantic Pact it is provided that an attack against one of the partners is an attack against each of the partners. So that if there were an attack, the President then would be free to do whatever is necessary with whatever available military power we have to resist that attack. This resolution, therefore, in nowise limits that.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I compliment the gentleman on offering his amendment. Would the gentleman consider a further amendment to the amendment, to add the words "in no event to exceed the number of 200,000 troops", so as to avoid the situation as referred to by the gentleman from New York?

Mr. COUDERT. I, personally, might not object to that, but I think there are possibly practical objections to it. I have heard other members say that they would accept this, but they would object to the 200,000 figure because that is a little too precise. Personally, I do not know how many troops ought to go. I am not offering this in opposition to NATO or for the purpose of limiting the operations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I think we are committed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Under the gentleman's amendment, what would be the situation if an emergency developed and we would have some 30 or 60 days prior notice that there was a requirement of more than six divisions in position for combat? Just what nullifying effect would the language of the gentleman's amendment have?

Mr. COUDERT. May I answer the gentleman's question with a question? How long does it take to call the Congress into session, if it happens to be out of session and for how many months in the year over the last 3 years, has Congress not been in session? In other words the answer is: So long as we are in the build-up period, Congressional authorization can be obtained in the twinkling of an eye where there is a showing of real necessity.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I venture to say to the gentleman that I cannot agree with his assumption because we have too much evidence in the past that the Congress has not functioned that rapidly.

Mr. COUDERT. I am afraid I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is a consistent position the gentleman takes.

Mr. COUDERT. The question is whether the Congress is going to have any authority in the matter of military affairs. We are faced here today with a question as to whether or not the Congress is going to retain any measure of authority in the Government of the United States. Today, we are in a situation where the hand that controls the Pentagon, rules the land. The Pentagon has two-thirds of our budget. The Pentagon has the power of life and death over all the manpower subject to the draft. It has a standing army of three and a half million men. Yet, we here in the Congress, as the thing stands today, have absolutely nothing to say and no authority over what is done with those troops. Yesterday in the New York Times, there was a letter by a very distinguished publicist, known all over the world, who says when the Korean war is over we should send four Army corps to Germany—to Europe—just as quickly as possible, instead of the single corps now there. I say to you, the time has come when the Congress must take a hand in this.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it provides not more than six divisions?

Mr. COUDERT. That is right.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the gentleman inform the committee as to his thoughts on any supporting corps of artillery or auxiliary troops which the Department

of Defense may need in addition to the six divisions?

Mr. COUDERT. The amendment speaks of ground troops—six divisions of ground troops. The Department has demonstrated very plainly that it does not recognize any very serious limitations as to what constitutes supporting troops. As somebody rather facetiously remarked the other day, he wondered if they would include the munition workers who make the munitions for the soldiers when they add up to make up a total.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is not the gentleman substituting his view for that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as to how best the 3,500,000 men can be deployed? The gentleman says it will be six divisions. He is doing that, and he wants Congress to do it instead of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So the 3,500,000 are being organized to oppose a particular potential enemy.

Mr. COUDERT. No, I am not substituting my judgment. I simply say that I am not prepared, so far I have anything to do with it, to trust my life and the lives of the people of my country solely to the generals.

Let me recall an observation of Clemenceau, one of the greatest statesmen in the world, when he said:

War is too serious a business to leave to the military.

If war is too serious a business to leave to the military, then certainly the conduct of war and peace and the Government of a great country at home and in its relations with the world is too serious a business to leave to the Joint Chiefs of Staff alone.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is not substituting his judgment for that of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He is simply writing into the law what the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is at this time, but in view of the fact that we had an entirely different understanding as to what the Joint Chiefs meant 2 years ago, the Congress at least could put in limitations that the Joint Chiefs of Staff say is sufficient at the present time. He is not substituting his judgment for theirs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman will recall, I supported as best I could a very similar amendment in connection with

the extension of the Selective Service. It might be of interest to recall that that amendment came within five votes of carrying. At that time it was urged that the resolution that had come from the other body was the proper way to get at it. Nothing has happened on that resolution. So I again say, here is the way to do it. We heard the observation of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] with respect to the right of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Commander-in-Chief to deploy troops. I am wondering if those who talk about troop deployment would carry that so far as to completely eliminate the Constitutional right, duty, and obligation of the Congress to declare war. It seems to me that they would pursue it so far that they would render Congress completely impotent in the making of that most tremendous and vital decision for the people of this country.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. The light of parliaments has been dying all over the world. It has been dying for the failure to do the very thing that this Congress is being asked to do now, and repeatedly asked to do; that is, assert its power and maintain its power as the representatives of the people and the guardians of the liberty of the people.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. Does not the gentleman realize that his amendment does not mean anything, in that under the reorganization plan it does not define what a division is? It may be 100,000 or 5,000 or 1,000. You limit it to six divisions, and it does not mean anything.

Mr. COUDERT. It depends on the extent to which the high officials of this Government will go in misleading the people of this United States. The Congress will be in session. If six divisions is not enough and the military say they would like to have eight divisions, as far as I am concerned they could have more if they could make a good case.

Let me make this plain: I am in favor of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. I am in favor of supporting Eisenhower's army, and nothing I do, to the best of my judgment, is going to impair the chance of making a success of that. But I honestly and firmly believe that the fact that Congress has something to say, that Congress must be consulted will be constructive rather than weaken the hands of General Eisenhower in his handling of American interests abroad.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it not true that we are assured continually that General Eisenhower and his staff are meeting with reasonable success in building up or at least laying the foundation for the building up or increase in the forces of the countries of Europe and that every unit they provide will take the place of an American unit?

Mr. COUDERT. I understand so.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. PRICE. As to the gentleman's amendment, first of all I do not believe the Congress is delegating any of its authority to anyone in providing that the Joint Chiefs of Staff may do certain things, make certain decisions. I have the feeling that if you leave these matters to Congress and open to debate in the Congress that you are simply giving the Kremlin blueprints of your plans far in advance.

Mr. COUDERT. To which I would like to say that the gentleman is an optimist indeed if he thinks that large bodies of troops can move across broad oceans to countries where three out of every four persons are either Communists or Communist sympathizers and not have the Kremlin learn about the facts.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I wish to concur in the thoughts the gentleman has presented that Congress should retain the power to make commitments of troops. In this particular instance, however, the gentleman's amendment provides for six divisions without any supporting troops whatsoever. From a practical point of view, if it is limited solely to six divisions, there will not be a well-rounded organization over there.

Mr. COUDERT. May I answer that by saying that the Senate resolution back in February said "six ground divisions." That then was interpreted by General Marshall and his military aides to be 200,000 men, and he included the troops needed for air defense and others that would have to go with it. Recently, too, General Collins indicated that six divisions in military parlance did include all the necessary auxiliary troops, air, and everything else; so six divisions in the military mind means a particular group. They understand it. The danger is not that they will construe it too narrowly.

Mr. DEVEREUX. I agree with the gentleman. Suppose you put a limitation in the amendment "six divisions or not over 200,000 troops," which would agree apparently with what they had in mind in the other body; would not that be a fairer presentation of the case?

Mr. COUDERT. One could make a case for it, but I think in view of the fact that after long debate this language received the support of the entire body of the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee and Armed Services Committee, supported by almost everybody else, that it goes a long way in accomplishing what we want to accomplish. As far as I am concerned, I would not be here on the floor today with this amendment if the leadership here had permitted the Senate resolution to come out on this floor and given us a chance to vote for it and adopt it.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the argument which has been advanced is a very persuasive one, but it proposes the adoption of an amendment which would be extremely limiting in its effect and which would be dangerous in operation. Despite the best of intentions, Congress

almost never moves rapidly. There are occasions, of course, when we are able to conduct business with great speed, but there are many more occasions when we do not.

There is another thing to take under consideration. If an explosion occurs, almost inevitably it is going to occur all over the world within a matter of hours. When the Reds move in Europe we will feel it at home. How do we know that simultaneously with the launching of a Red attack on Western Europe there will not be an atomic attack on Washington, and in the shambles that would follow, how quickly could the Congress move, if, indeed, there were anything left of Congress to act?

Now, the pending amendment wants us to usurp powers not heretofore exercised by the Congress. In the history of the Nation we have plenty of precedents to show that we should not now usurp this kind of power.

Then the proposal goes one step further. It is limited to ground troops only. Why ground troops only? If it is good for one branch of the service, why is it not good for all?

Mr. Chairman, we do not conduct military operations by law. You do not pass a bill each time forces are to be moved in a strategic area, or into and out of combat. You conduct military operations from strategic and tactical considerations.

What is the problem? Our people in Europe are facing a foe in their immediate vicinity of 1,000,000 men. By this amendment we could very well jeopardize the life of every American in Europe. We could jeopardize the chances that we have of preventing Europe from being overrun and of turning its population and industrial capacity, over to the Reds. Reinforcements may have to go very quickly to Europe. It is not the plan at this time to send them. That has clearly been brought out. But things may occur which may make it necessary to send them and to send them quickly.

Every military leader says this limiting and dangerous amendment could be extremely bad and they see no good that could come of it. It would tie the hands of the military. It would set up the Congress as the director of tactical and strategic operations, and we are not equipped, prepared, or trained to act in that capacity. We have to depend upon our military leaders for military decisions. If we do not have confidence enough in the ones we have to depend on them, we had better get rid of them and get some others. The NATO forces are being built up to be the principal defenders of Europe, but this will take time. At the moment we must not tie the hands of the people we are depending on to hold the line until the NATO forces are stronger.

We have the assurance of the Joint Chiefs of Staff that they will discuss these matters with the proper committees of Congress at any time it appears there is a need for more troops for Europe. They have shown no indication of wanting to proceed without going into these matters with the proper committees of Congress and I do not see how we can ask for more.

I trust the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Certainly with the great difficulties General Eisenhower is experiencing with the development of the MDAP program, I do not believe this is the appropriate time to discuss the troops for Europe question.

The bill before us is an appropriation bill and we should pass it today to indicate to the world that this war effort is an all-out one and we are determined to see it through.

So far as the defense of Western Europe is concerned, certainly it is essential that we protect the vital areas containing those raw materials, industrial plants, and technically skilled workers which constitute the major war potential of that continent. We must also be in a position to protect, for our forces and those of our allies, strategically located air bases from which we can deliver blows against the enemy and to hold such bases against attack by air or ground, or both. Finally, we must, if we are to succeed, fire the hopes and raise the morale of the people of Western Europe and build their determination to protect their homes and way of life.

As I have stated before, the Red army and its satellite forces now poised along the unnatural boundary from Stettin to Trieste are capable of marching into Western Europe at any time. The fear of swift retaliation delivered by our Air Force no doubt acts as a deterrent; and I fervently hope that it will remain so until we can improve our situation.

However, it is my opinion that no such retaliation could stop a march of the Russian ground armies, and the interruption to their lines of supply and communication would not become effective for some months.

Ever since 1945 the Russians have been building tanks, artillery, and other weapons, and it may safely be assumed that if they commence hostilities in this region they will have stockpiles of supplies and ammunition to last for a considerable period.

We must be prepared, with the aid of our allies, in event they move, to first stop the Russian Army, and second, to roll it back as speedily as possible. We must have ground forces in Europe able to stop their armies. Later, in order to dislodge them and drive them back to their own country.

I have urged before—and shall again—that our State Department take more vigorous and affirmative action toward securing the invaluable assistance of troops from Western Germany and Spain. It is gratifying to know that something along this line is now being done. I likewise hope that our allies in Britain and France will develop effective armies within a comparatively short time. At the present, though, I

am convinced that the maintenance of Western Europe as a part of the free world requires the presence of American ground forces.

We have pumped twenty-five or more billion dollars into Europe. To fail to protect, with the help of our allies, the Ruhr and Saar Valleys with their great industrial potential, would be a fatal mistake. The recovery of Europe is now almost complete. Morale is growing stronger daily.

General Eisenhower is turning in a magnificent performance under difficult circumstances and we cannot let him down. The American people have confidence in him to do this job, which is a most difficult one. Now that we have launched this defense program, let us not make his task more difficult by again raising this question, which puts fear in the hearts of the people of Europe, as to whether or not we intend to carry through.

Let us wait until General Eisenhower submits to us a further report. I think he will insist that the other countries do their share and that we do no more than our share as far as ground forces are concerned. Let us wait to hear what he expects us to do before we again raise this question.

There was a time when it could be said by Americans that the wars and the welfare of those distant lands were of no immediate concern to us; but that is no longer true. The growth of scientific knowledge, increasing complexity of scientific inventions and industrial productivity have so reduced the size of the world and increased the interdependency of all nations upon each other that whether it pleases or pains us, we must be constantly and increasingly concerned with the trend of events in lands beyond the sea.

Today the world is again becoming an armed camp. Soviet aggression and the dictatorial lust of the warlords of the Kremlin have caused the grim specter of war to haunt us and it is brought home daily by the loss of our boys in Korea.

The dearly-bought liberties of the people of this Nation are in peril, and if we fail to exercise that vigilance which has always been the price of liberty, we shall have betrayed the sweat, the tears, the blood, and the sacrifices of our forefathers.

We must labor and we must give without stint in this all-out effort to build a great national defense program to prepare this country to meet any and all emergencies and demands that may be made upon us.

I have deep faith that America will not fail mankind in this critical hour. Let us work and strive together in this great all-out effort to return the world to peace and stability.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, we have got to get across to Europe the idea that they must prepare to defend themselves on the ground soon. Our Foreign Affairs Committee has spent 7 weeks in hearings on the mutual security program on the question of military and economic aid to other countries, including this NATO structure. I am supporting

this amendment, because I think it will help, not hurt, in getting Europe to take the necessary steps for her own defense. I am not substituting my judgment for the Joint Chiefs of Staff or our military leaders, but because the six divisions represent their judgment as to what is now needed.

Let me quote a colloquy that I had with General Collins on July 19, during the hearings. This will be found in the printed hearings, so that it is public, not secret:

Mr. VORYS. I want to remind you that exactly the same representations were made as to possible ground forces in Europe, on and off the record, to this committee in 1949, that were made before the Senate committee.

Now on February 19, 1951, in the Senate hearings on assignment of ground forces in the European area, Senator GREEN said to you, as follows:

"Senator GREEN. Up to the present time under the conditions as you see them now and believe you can reasonably forecast them, six divisions will do the trick?"

"General COLLINS. Under the present world conditions, yes, sir."

"Senator GREEN. Thank you."

I want to ask you whether your answer would still be the same to that question.

General COLLINS. Yes. Essentially the same.

Now that is under present conditions and conditions that can reasonably be forecast. Do not forget what the NATO idea was, and I quote General Bradley before our committee in 1949:

In our approach to this arms-aid program, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have followed the principle that the man in the best position, and with the capability, should do the job for which he is best suited.

Further, our recommendations for this program have been predicated upon this basic principle, and the following assumed factors:

First, the United States will be charged with the strategic bombing.

We have repeatedly recognized in this country that the first priority of the joint defense is our ability to deliver the atomic bomb.

Second, the United States Navy and the western union naval powers will conduct essential naval operations, including keeping the sea lanes clear. The western union and other nations will maintain their own harbor and coastal defense.

Third, we recognize that the hard core of the ground power in being will come from Europe, aided by other nations as they can mobilize.

Fourth, England, France, and the closer countries will have the bulk of the short-range-attack bombardment, and air defense. We, of course, will maintain the tactical Air Force for our own ground and naval forces, and United States defense.

Fifth, other nations, depending upon their proximity or remoteness from the possible scene of conflict, will emphasize appropriate specific missions.

Let us get clear what we are doing for NATO and for Europe. We are furnishing all the strategic bombing, and all of the money for strategic air in this vast bill under consideration is committed to that part of the defense of Europe. We have no limitations on our naval support. We are going to put in an amount equal to about 10 percent of the fifty-six billions you have got here in this bill today for military equipment of the forces

of Europe; but when it comes to ground forces, we are only to furnish a token force of six divisions. We furnish this force that will be in being on the ground there under article 3 of the treaty, but if this plan for the defense of Europe is to work at all, Europe has got to build up rapidly its own ground forces very soon. Eisenhower and his generals have said we have got to make it clear to them that our part in the ground phase of it is to end soon. The way to make it end soon is to make it clear that what the Joint Chiefs have said is sufficient for now and the foreseeable future, is going to be all there is on the ground from us. Otherwise, Europe will dawdle and delay, thinking we will increase our ground forces some more.

We turned over our billions committed in strategic air power to the defense of Europe. We have turned over the strongest Navy in the world to the defense of Europe without any limitation on our Commander in Chief. We have turned over billions of dollars' worth of arms and military equipment to equip and maintain their divisions, but when it comes to fighting on the ground they are supposed to furnish the hard core, as General Bradley said, and we are supposed merely to furnish the forces of six divisions, including support forces that have been described here today. So that for the sake of defending Europe we ought to make it clear that we are not going on and on in this emergency with more and more ground forces.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect and admiration for the gentleman from New York who has offered this amendment. I would not take the floor at this time did I not feel it to be matter of patriotic duty that the Members of the House at this time should have a clear understanding of what they are voting on.

There are two articles in this NATO organization, article III and article V, that relate to this situation. Article III relates to what might be done before hostilities might break out. Article V relates to what might be done in the event hostilities actually do break out. Under article V there is no limitation as to what might be done either under the Senate resolution, which was advisory only, or under the amendment which has here been offered. But we all know that the situation we are confronted with in Europe will not be measured so much by what is done after hostilities break as by what is done in the line of preparation and deliberate preparedness for what might come.

For my own part, I have no more confidence than the gentleman who has offered this amendment in the present administration or in what it might do but, frankly, I do not want to be a party to saying that there must be a definite limit fixed upon the number of troops or the number of divisions that may be sent to Europe to protect the situation we are in in the world today. We are in that situation, in my opinion, entirely because of the incompetence of our administra-

tion and the incompetence of the State Department. I think there can be little gainsaying of that.

How are we, without knowing just what the situation is we are going to confront, going to say 1 division, 2 divisions, 3 divisions, 4 divisions, 6 divisions, or 10 divisions are what should be sent?

Frankly, I am as disturbed as anyone at the failure at this time and so far on the part of our allies to devote as much as I believe they should devote to the building up of their defenses and to the development of the armed forces for which they have unquestionably available manpower to meet the situation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman says he has no confidence in this administration. Yet is he willing to turn over authority to this administration?

Mr. TABER. I think if the gentleman will wait until I finish he will find the answer to that. If I have not given it, then I will yield.

Mr. Chairman, having this situation in mind, I requested the chairman of our subcommittee to have General Collins before our subcommittee this morning. General Collins appeared. If I may be permitted to do so, I will read briefly from what was said:

Mr. MAHON. What does the Department of Defense anticipate doing in the fiscal year 1952 in addition to the program which you have outlined involving about 284,000 Army troops in round numbers and about 60,000 Air Force troops?

General COLLINS. Nothing. This is the total program for 1952.

Mr. MAHON. In the event you wanted to revise the program in the light of unforeseen developments, what would you do?

General COLLINS. I do not doubt a bit but that we would come up to the Congress and discuss it. Certainly we have made it a policy, so far as the Army is concerned, to always consult with the chairman of the two committees, and the chairman of this committee.

Mr. MAHON. If there should be any change in the fiscal year 1952 in your plans, insofar as troops for Europe are concerned, you would make sure that this committee is notified and that the whole committee, not just the chairman, is given information with regard to the plan in advance of the definite and final decisions?

General COLLINS. I will, definitely.

Mr. TABER. Can we say that on the floor of the House?

General COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TABER. That before you make a move you will call the attention of the committee to what you propose to do?

General COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. TABER. And will you give the committee a chance to talk with you?

General COLLINS. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. Can we also give on the floor of the House the figures that you have given in your statement?

General COLLINS. I believe you can, Mr. MAHON.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does the gentleman understand those are also the views of General Marshall who has told the country in the last 2 weeks that it will be 400,000 plus troops?

Mr. TABER. I did not ask General Marshall. General Collins is in command of the Army. It is customary to deal with such things with the Chief of Staff of the Army insofar as they relate to the Army. General Marshall's statement undoubtedly included the figures relating to the Air Force. Frankly, we have never in our experience with the Army, Navy or the Air Force, found that they have failed to meet a promise which they have made to the committee along this line.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Is it not a fact that General Collins, as Chief of Staff, this morning also stated that from the military point of view it would be a very serious mistake to place a definite limitation on the number of troops?

Mr. TABER. That is correct. In addition to that, we all realize, and must realize, that when these officers of the Army agree to take up a thing like that with the Committee on Appropriations, it could be taken up without having the thing out in the open, practically coming to the point of discussion whether or not we were going into trouble with Russia and letting Russia know all about what we were going to do. For my own part, I do not want them doing that.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to see if we can get some limitation on time for debate.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to speak on this subject, and I would like more than 5 minutes, if possible.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems clear from the way the debate has proceeded so far that if we pass this amendment we are not going to limit the number of troops going to Europe. That is clear from the testimony that is referred to in support of the amendment. It can be 200,000 or 400,000 or antiaircraft and many other troop units can be added. I served in the Army, and a great many others have. They know that when you add the AA and the corps and Army artillery and the various troops of other auxiliary and supply services you have an estimate of six divisions, but you cannot put a firm roof on the number of troops. Everybody understands that. Hence, what is the reason for proposing this amendment? The reason is to give expression, I believe, of the intent of Congress, and to assert what the proponent of the amendment claims to be the power of Congress, that Congress should control the place to which the Commander in Chief and the Joint Chiefs of Staff may deploy troops.

I will not repeat the splendid argument made by the gentleman from New

York [Mr. TABER] against this amendment, but I would like to take up where he left off. Let us see from the point of view of assessing the capability of those opposed to us what this means to the Communists. That is whom this mobilization is directed toward defending against. Let us see what it means to them if we pass this amendment. It means two things, as I see it, of great importance, and it represents a real gain for them.

First, those of us who have been deeply concerned about how much we have already told them about what is our basic strategy will find that we have by this amendment only agreed for the future to take them further into our confidence.

Suppose General Collins says tomorrow: "I do not need only six divisions for Europe. I now need eight divisions." Then we have got to come back to the floor and amend this bill or take some other legislative action, which expresses the very reason why we are proposing to change our troop employment for any observer in the gallery to note.

Secondly, what are the Communists going to do with this amendment, if we pass it? They will blast their propaganda everywhere in the world, saying: "You see, we told you. These American representatives, these American generals can go around the world and ask you to be all out for defense, but they are not going to be all for defense, because their Congress is still holding back—going part way—showing again those views which they had in the nineteen twenties."

This will be used in their propaganda to support the phoney argument the Soviets have been making about how we intend to deal with our allied peoples in respect of mutuality of sacrifice. I think it is a mistake then to adopt this amendment at this particular time, especially when it does, as it admitted, no substantial good to a roof on troops.

A lot has been said here about the dignity and power of the Congress. But there is also the question whether the Congress is not stepping out of its established powers and if the amendment proposed would not, if carried, amount to taking over the powers of the Executive as Commander in Chief? Are we not by this amendment seeking to assume to ourselves the prerogatives and functions of military command? Clearly contrary to the constitutional arrangement for three effective branches of Government.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman mean to assert that while we in this House are passing a nearly \$60,000,000,000 military bill with another six, or eight, or thirteen billions to come tomorrow, that anybody could even fool the Russian people to believe that we are not serious about this business?

Mr. JAVITS. I mean to assert exactly that if we are going to write such provisions as this amendment provides for, about the deployment of troops, where they can be sent and used; I mean to assert exactly that if we are going to try to be the generals in this House,

435 of us, instead of having some confidence ourselves in the military command that the Congress itself confirms.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman honestly believe that you can send American divisions to Germany and not have the Kremlin know of that not more than 2 seconds afterward?

Mr. JAVITS. I said no such thing; I said only that we will soon be letting them know much more by adopting this amendment, and I am not in favor of letting them know any more than we must about our fundamental strategy which should be among the most highly classified secrets of the United States.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not like to find myself in disagreement with anyone here and certainly not in disagreement with my very dear friend, JOHN TABER. Certainly I think it is seldom that I disagree with him, but on this occasion I must.

Before I get into the merits of this matter I want to pay some attention to the remarks just made by my very dear friend and able Representative the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. He gets up here and worries about what the Kremlin is going to do, what they are going to think. May I say to my friend that it is about time we here put that out of our minds. This is a great Nation in which we live. We should not worry about what the Kremlin thinks about what we do. I sincerely hope we will no longer hear it said, as a conclusive answer or argument against anything that may be proposed, that it is going to be a great victory for the Kremlin. As a matter of fact, may I say to my friend that there is one great thing that distinguishes this country of ours from Russia, and that is that here in this Hall and in this great seat of government in the United States of America are gathered the representatives of the people who yet exercise under our great Constitution the powers there allocated to the legislative branch of the Government. There is no such thing in Russia. Why should it be argued that possibly we here should so abdicate our responsibilities under that Constitution as to create in this country that sort of dictatorial one-man government which now exists in Russia? For my part I want no part of it. I am not going to duck my responsibility. I shall yield to the military the responsibilities that are theirs, but I have some responsibilities, to; and, certainly, I am going to exercise them.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the gentleman would be the last man in the world to want to suppress a view as to something we contemplate doing which I sincerely feel might help the Communists opposed to us. Would we not be unwise, indeed, if we debated in a vacuum, taking no account of the power of the Communist forces or what they could do with the openings we give them. The fundamental thing about military science, as

the gentleman knows as well as I, is, first, our own capability; and second, the "enemy" capability. Intelligence about what the other side will do is vital and must always be taken into account. We certainly want to consider that. That is all I have ever asked.

I have fought for bills to arm us even more against the Communist menace as the gentleman knows, on the affirmative side. Even now my position on this very amendment is exactly along this line. I think it is vital to point out, however, whether what we are doing will aid those against us in any material way, and what I said can only be construed in that sense.

Mr. HALLECK. I did not challenge the gentleman's right to say what he did and I did not question his integrity or his convictions. It may well be that his argument here is sound as against mine. I have only asserted my view in respect to it.

Now, let us reflect a moment on what has transpired. First of all, you will recall that when the Atlantic Treaty was up in the Senate, both the State Department and the Military Department assured the Members of Congress that troops to Europe would not be committed except with congressional approval. Then troops were committed to Europe without congressional approval and the people said, "What goes on here?"

That started what has come to be known as the great debate. It was somewhat overwhelmed by certain other things that happened in the Asiatic theater having to do with the dismissal of General MacArthur. What we are doing here is carrying on a part of that so-called great debate in another chapter.

Let us get this thing clear. Reference has been made to a troop limitation that is here contained. Does not everyone realize that reference to six divisions, and it is, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] said, apparently something of an accordion operation, is a term that is understood, and when we limit it to divisions I suppose it carries with it necessarily, or certainly it would be so interpreted, the supporting troops that are necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, it seems very clear to me that all we say in the adoption of this amendment is that the six divisions now committed shall go on under the Atlantic Pact, but before additional divisions are committed the Congress of the United States shall be consulted, the Congress of the United States being the representatives of the people. Can anyone deny that? To me it is no argument to say that General Collins appeared before the Appropriations Committee or a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee today and

said that during 1952 we have in mind nothing beyond the six divisions that are already committed.

If that is true, and that testimony is to be made public may I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] maybe it is giving aid and comfort to the Kremlin. I do not know, but if that is the proposed plan of our military leaders at the time, then what damage is done to say that for the time covered by this bill further commitments shall be brought to the Congress of the United States? For the life of me, I cannot see why there should be any concern about it.

As has been pointed out, almost this identical resolution, but in a directive form, was adopted in the other body by an overwhelming vote.

A similar amendment to this was offered to the Selective Service Act. It lost by five votes in the Committee of the Whole with a large membership present. One of the principal arguments at that time was that in due course the resolution that came out of the other body would come before the House of Representatives, and we here could express our opinion as the opinion was expressed in the other body. So, the Towe amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey was defeated by five votes. But, in the meantime that resolution has never been reported by the Committee and we have had no opportunity to pass on it.

Now we come along to appropriate the money to provide for the national defense, clearly the prerogative of the Congress of the United States, the bill originating in the House of Representatives. So, what do we do by this amendment? We simply say six divisions. We do not quarrel about that, but in this great decision that might be subsequently made we think the Congress of the United States should be further consulted. And let no one think for a minute that the Congress of the United States will not meet any responsibility that it is required to meet in the best interests of our country and its security. In all of my time here I have never seen the Congress fail to respond when such a crisis as that came along, and I venture to assert that the Congress always will be ready to respond. Now then, if the military should find reason to come to the Committee on Appropriations or to a subcommittee thereof and say "We need more troops than the six divisions," then should not you and I, as just Members of the House of Representatives have a part in that voice? We, too, should have those representations made to us to the end that we, too, might participate in the making of that decision. As I said, I spoke on this matter when it was before us earlier in this session. I cannot think of anything better now than to just quote a few of the paragraphs from what I said then:

In all the arguments I have read and heard incident to the current debate in no case has anyone challenged the constitutional right of the Congress to declare war. No one has suggested that there is any ambiguity whatsoever in article I, section 8, clause 11 of the Constitution which sets out in un-

equivocable terms that the Congress shall have power to declare war.

Does anyone here contend that the framers of the Constitution intended that such power should be a purely academic aftermath of Executive action? Was the historic role of the Congress meant to consist of an accessory after the fact?

I submit that it was precisely because the matter of troop deployment is so closely allied to the power of declaring war that the Congress was given iron-clad assurances by the administration, during the Senate discussion of the proposed Atlantic Pact arrangement, that acceptance of this treaty would in no way involve this country in a commitment of troops.

Then I said this also, and it fits today as it did then:

We must face up to the fact that we are living in a time when a declaration of war has become an old-fashioned device in the minds of many. Wars today culminate in shooting after a step-by-step process in which the representatives of the people are being increasingly euhed into impotence.

The founders of this Nation realized full well the grave implications of a declaration of war; that the power to make such a declaration—a move which plunges any nation into the darkness of death and destruction—should never be vested in a single man.

Is it conceivable, then, that in placing this great responsibility on the shoulders of the Congress, the framers of our Constitution meant that the Congress should exercise no authority in that great twilight zone between peace and war? Was the Congress meant to sit idly by, waiting for the darkness of conflict to fall?

The issue before us is simple: Shall the Congress abdicate its historic and constitutional right and obligation to make major decisions affecting the lives and resources of the people it has been elected to represent? Shall momentous decisions be usurped by the executive branch of the Government, leaving to the Congress purely academic powers of providing the wherewithal in men and money to carry out the designs and adventures of the administration, whatever they may be?

In other words, may I say to my friends in the House, I cannot see where the adoption of this amendment represents any retreat at all from our firm determination to protect this great country of ours and to meet our responsibilities and obligations in a world beset with fear of destruction and war.

On the contrary, it seems to mean only that we here in Congress insist that we share in the making of these great decisions, that we here shall have our voice and our say in what those decisions shall be.

Finally, let me say this: Wholly apart from the technical aspects of the matter, this great country of ours, great as it is, cannot meet its obligations in the world, we cannot protect ourselves at home, unless the people of the country have confidence in what is being done here and are sure that the decisions that are made are in the national interest. I do not think it is too much to say that certain people in great numbers in this country have lost a lot of their confidence in certain branches of the Government. I hope and trust they have not lost their confidence in the legislative branch of the Government, but I assert this, that any decision vitally affecting the lives of the people, joined in by the Congress of

the United States, will better enlist the support of the people generally. It is that support that we must have if we are to be successful in meeting these great problems that confront us.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it would be possible to get a limitation on the time for debate on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 40 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 35 minutes, with 5 minutes reserved to the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment. I do so for two reasons. In the first place, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY] so eloquently said, it will put our European allies more definitely on notice that they themselves must furnish more of the resources of war, particularly the manpower, for the defense of Europe and the free world. It seems to me this needs to be emphasized at this time. We should now decide what is to be the major contribution of the United States of America to our own defense and to the defense of free peoples everywhere. It must be clear to everyone that the Soviet Kremlin, representing the enemy of the free world, ardently desires two things. First of all, its leaders desire that we bankrupt ourselves in this country by draining away our material resources. Secondly, that we bankrupt ourselves in manpower. Facing this situation we must decide what our major contribution can be. I submit that it is not manpower. We have contributed the major amount of manpower to the Korean War. We have done so largely because we went into this thing unilaterally and then begged the rest of our allies to come along. It just happens that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and I, while in Korea last April, stood with the British troops and watched them fighting the foe. We were also with the Turks and the French, and with many others of our brave allies there. Certainly they were good soldiers and they were brave, but there just were not enough of them.

We cannot furnish the manpower to whip the Communist forces all over the world. Our great contribution can be two things. First of all, in the sinews of war to give our allies the guns, and the planes, and the tanks, and the things that can be made by retaining as much of our manpower as we can in our industries and in production of food here

at home. Secondly, the specific contribution, militarily speaking, of greatest importance, is air power. The Kremlin does not fear our manpower in a land army in Korea, in Germany, or anywhere else. The one thing the Kremlin fears most of all is the striking force of our air power. If we had used that air power in Korea we could have won that war by now. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] and I talked to generals and colonels and others clear on down to the GI's.

All the American officers and men we talked to declared we could win the war in Korea decisively, by full use of our air power in bombing the enemy military targets and preventing any future build-ups in enemy forces. We could have won that war, but we did not, because our policy makers were tied to the old idea of the infantry being the "Magnet line" of offense and defense.

If we build up our air power in Europe to sufficient strength, it will not be necessary to drain off our manpower for land armies. Manpower is abundant in Europe, while it is the most expensive thing among the resources of our country.

Why did we not follow the policy of utilizing the manpower of our allies in the far-eastern conflict? One of our great allies in the United Nations, the free Chinese, offered troops for the Korean war. Our State Department planners refused to use them. Recently I visited Formosa, where I saw thousands of fine young Chinese men languishing in idleness while our American boys fought and died in an indecisive war. Every one of those Chinese could take his place in the fight for freedom. These Chinese troops could relieve many American boys, drafted from off the farms and out of the industries and schools of this country.

Mr. Chairman, the principal sources of manpower for defense of Europe should be the Europeans themselves. We could utilize to good advantage hundreds of thousands of German personnel for the military establishment in the NATO nations. The German armies are now our allies. We should move quickly to draw them into the orbit of peaceful and democratic nations. They have a personal interest in defending themselves against Communist aggression, for their land is divided and a large share of it is now under the yoke of the Kremlin. We should call on them to furnish their share of manpower requirements to stand against Soviet expansion.

We should utilize also the manpower of Spain, of Greece, of Turkey, and all other actual or potential allies who are willing to oppose further Communist aggression.

Let us inform the whole world, here and now, that our principal contribution to the defense of the free world will be the sinews of war, emphasizing our superior and unbeatable air power, and that we expect our allies to furnish the bulk of the manpower.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the most ardent supporter of the North Atlantic Pact principle should support this amendment. Consider the picture. Each of us who believe in the North Atlantic principle of the defense of Europe, and of our own country, knows that the manpower potential, the vast numbers that are needed, must be secured from the countries in Europe. They must provide the vast manpower requirements while we provide the sinews of war. But so long as we stand with a blank check in the hands of the President, or the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or anyone in charge who can say without regard to the Congress of the United States, "More and more American men can and will be sent over to make up this European army." Just so long will those countries in Europe be reticent to provide their own manpower. That is human nature. The pressure will be put upon our military officers in charge of the North Atlantic Pact to provide American soldiers. They will do this, that is, unless the Congress representing all the people of our country say right out frankly that there is a limit, and that we are the body that will impose that limit. Only if the European countries know American boys won't be sent over without limit will the European countries provide the manpower needed. If Congress takes this stand by adopting the Coudert amendment, then there is a chance for the North Atlantic agreement countries to really build up a big army out of the manpower they have at home. But unless and until we on this side let them know what that limit is, the pressure will be on here to take more from our country, and to provide less and less of the sacrifice which is necessary from their own country.

We have been conducting hearings and considering this bill for months; this bill to spend billions of dollars. We have held hearings. We have considered with care whether or not we are wasting money and we have decided that we are not. But now, without hearings of any kind, we are going to spend the manpower of our great country at the will and whim, if you please, of men in charge of the armed services of our country; men who, above all, are not representatives of the people as we are. You are asking Congress to give them a blank check to spend the lives of the young men and young women of our country. When it comes to dollars, you are going to have hearings and you are going to look at the almighty dollar before you send dollars abroad. You are not going to reserve the right to say whether the sons of your neighbors shall be sent overseas or not. Rather, you are going to entrust some military power, not responsible to the people at all, and give them that right. Why not use the same degree of care in preserving the young men of America you have used in spending dollars? Let the people's representatives in Congress say not only whether dollars shall be sent to Europe but, in addition, whether our sons and daughters shall be sent there to fight.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to belabor the issue. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and others have explained fully and adequately the reasons for this amendment.

I simply want to assert that the United States Congress may as well abdicate if it is going to continue to turn over to President Truman or any other President the powers and responsibilities delegated to it under the Constitution.

The power to declare war and send troops to battle on foreign soil is a power that must be retained by Congress. If it is not so retained, the very structure of this Government will eventually fall.

I support this amendment to limit American ground troops in Europe to six divisions without action by Congress to increase this strength. I only wish it were possible in this amendment to define the numerical strength of the divisions so disposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, this is a dangerous amendment. It seeks to legislate military strategy. I hope the House will not be misled by it. I am compelled to rise in opposition to the proposal of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The amendment addresses itself to the question of the power and authority of the President to send troops wherever he deems it necessary in the interest of national security. I do not agree with the gentleman or any Member of the House who would seek to amend this legislation to require congressional approval to send troops to Europe or anywhere else in the interest of national security. They are at once attempting to read the minds of the masters of the Kremlin and failing to read the Constitution of the United States.

Article II, section 2, of the Constitution asserts that the President shall be "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States, when called into the actual service of the United States." I do not recall that ever before in our history has the authority of the President to command, thus delegated by the Constitution, been questioned. The authority of a field commander to deploy his troops can scarcely be limited, if the commander is to win victory in the field. The authority of the Commander in Chief to deploy his troops cannot be limited to a geographic area.

Whatever the mistakes American generals may have made in the past, whatever mistakes have been made in the current Korean conflict, neither Congress nor the President has presumed to set up rules governing the deployment of troops. The number of troops employed in any campaign or battle—North Africa, France, Ardennes, North Korea—has always been governed by factors quite different from congressional legis-

lative act. In a world in which the threat to our security may come from almost any direction, it is folly to tell the Commander in Chief how many troops he may send into any theater or battle; or when he may send them. What Congress can say to a general, and what Congress does say when it approves his commission is "We have faith in your ability in a way to justify our faith." But it is the people themselves, not Congress, who say this to the President.

It is ridiculous and worse to presume to tell the Commander in Chief how he is to deploy the troops he commands, it is also ridiculous to assume that the next aggression of the Communist overlords of Europe and Asia will break out in Europe. Why not in India? Why not in Iran? For Congress to enact an amendment governing the deployment of troops to Europe, is as ridiculous as it would be for a householder to ask a single policeman to guard his front door only, leaving the back door open to a gang of thieves. No man in the United States, indeed, no man outside the Kremlin knows where communism may strike next, or in what force, or what effort will be required on our part to meet it. What we need is a riot squad, ready for action anywhere.

I cannot believe that the sponsors of so foolish and ridiculous an amendment as this we are considering are interested in doing anything more than creating an embarrassment to the President of the United States.

Surely they are ignoring the functions and the prerogatives of the Presidency and the safeguards established in the Constitution and operative under the American system. Surely they are proving their ignorance of military strategy and presuming to direct the actions of field commanders as well as Commander in Chief. But most tragically, they are displaying a lack of faith in the American system that has served us so well for almost two hundred years. Do they fear the President more than they trust the system and the electorate that has made him Commander in Chief? Do they think that he alone can do what no American President has ever done, or presumed to do, and commit us to an untenable situation without the advice of military leaders? Do they think our future as a Nation is threatened more by maintaining unaltered the historic functions of the President than by the growth of communism? Do they think that war is played, like football, with a fixed number of men?

Mr. Chairman, there seems to me only one interpretation of this proposed amendment. It is an action taken to embarrass the President, to handicap our military leaders, and to create national security by statute rather than by strength in being.

If war comes, the United States cannot win it alone. We won neither World War I alone, nor World War II. In another war, we would have even fewer allies. And those allies will fight only if we give them hope and confidence.

Those allies will not fight if we tell them that only a limited number of divisions will be sent to them, and that even that limited number will be sent not by the Commander in Chief but by Congress, after prolonged debate. Those allies will not fight against a Russian Army of limitless manpower, certain to overwhelm them, unless they have confidence the United States will support them. But what confidence can they have in us when we display so little confidence in our own system, our own President, and, indeed, in ourselves?

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would have us prepare against unlimited aggression with limited effort; it would handicap and embarrass those charged with providing the common defense and security of the United States.

It is dangerous to our national security. It would impair the peace of the world. It should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, not too long ago Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower addressed the Members of this body. He told us that one of the things needed so desperately in Europe was a spirit of confidence in the NATO countries in their ability to defend their freedoms. He reported that Europe's "will to resist" had been bolstered by our support, in implementing the Atlantic Pact. The spirit of defeatism had to be overcome before Western Europe would rebuild its armies and join in confidence with us to deter Communist aggression. If we by our action today, through adoption of the amendment offered, hinder General Eisenhower in his efforts to build up the spirit and the will to resist in Europe, then we will have destroyed everything we hope to accomplish by the adoption of this bill. Certainly, if we say to those countries, "We have given you all the support we are going to give you," then they will look around to see if they can defend themselves with the forces they have. The Russians will start their propaganda machine immediately. If we limit our military to six divisions the Communists are going to say to France and Western Germany and the Benelux countries, "You cannot defend yourselves with this force." Why bother at all to build up an army? Why bother at all to have a military budget? The resultant spirit of defeatism would render impossible General Eisenhower's mission and would require us to send many more divisions overseas if Europe is to be denied to the Russians. General Eisenhower's whole purpose in building up a "will to resist" in Europe, and in turn building up the forces of the NATO countries will be defeated.

As I recall, General MacArthur, when he appeared before the Russell committee, was asked the question as to whether or not we should limit troops to Europe, and he responded that we should not place the military in a legislative straitjacket with respect to the disposition or utilization of our forces in accomplishing their mission.

General Bradley said that the purpose of adopting this appropriation bill was to

build up a sufficient force, as soon as practicable, to act as a deterrent to further aggression. We are building up troops to act as a deterrent to further war. The most strategic area in the world is the Ruhr, because if Russia gets the Ruhr their industrial production will come dangerously close to ours.

Now, if we tell the Russians we are only going to assign six divisions to the defense of the Ruhr, we are inviting attack because we know from experience that the Communists will exploit any situation of weakness. If that is to be the effect of this amendment, and I do not see how it can be otherwise, then there is no use whatsoever for us to adopt this \$56,000,000,000 bill.

In the last war thousands of our American boys gave their lives to obtain a beachhead in Europe. Let us not abandon that beachhead by adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN] is recognized.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose here to try to give to the House some of the viewpoints of the majority of the people in my district, how I think they feel about this particular troops-to-Europe situation.

In asking someone like myself to vote on this measure it reminds me of the question a famous lawyer put to the defendant: "When did you stop beating your wife?" In other words, if you vote against this limitation of only six divisions to Europe you are in fact giving approval of sending unlimited troops to Europe; on the other hand, if you vote for a limitation you are then saying in effect that you are in agreement with sending six divisions but this is all you are going to do, guide yourself accordingly.

But there is another thought to bear in mind, that is the thought of protecting our own shores and building up our own defenses, in having an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force to defend our own country in the event we should ever be attacked.

The question of troops to Europe in my mind and in the minds of a great number of my constituents is the question: Do we want to go to war or do we want to remain at peace? If we want to go to war I think it is the duty of Congress and the administration to tell the people coldly and bluntly that we are preparing for war with Russia; let them know; let them in on it; let them feel that they have to be consulted, because, after all, let us not kid ourselves, gentlemen, the only reason any of us are here is because we are supposed to represent the people who sent us here.

When I think of six divisions more or less in Europe I am afraid. I remember Bataan and Corregidor, I remember France quitting after very little effort; I remember Dunkirk. Are we going to take the lives of these six divisions and say to ourselves that we are going to entrust these boys to Europe and that we hope the Europeans are going to fight to protect our boys, your boys, our loved ones? I am afraid, and I am scared; and if a record vote comes up on this amend-

ment, if it does come, I am going to vote "Present" because I do not think in the light of the past 10 years experience that I can trust six divisions or any part of it to the whims and fancies of France, and Belgium, and other countries over there who history shows may not fight to defend our boys.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, when this amendment was first brought to my attention I questioned the advisability of such a move on the part of the Congress; but after listening to the very able speech by my colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], I have decided to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have delegated far too much authority already to just a few men in Government. I am very sure that if the Congress had long ago asserted itself in no uncertain terms and had really lived up to its responsibilities, we would not be in the terrible predicament today all over the world as well as right here in our own beloved land. So I am going to vote for the Coudert amendment because certainly the time is long past due when we must not only begin to think about our own prerogatives but also we must think about where we are going to get the money.

We are taxing our people to such a degree that until these terrific expenditures of Government are brought in line with the people's ability to pay, one of these days the American people will lose complete faith in this form of government and in everything we hold dear. When that time comes we in America will be of no use or no good to our friends across the sea let alone to ourselves, because we will be broke, broke, broke, do you understand, broke flat.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will all think very deeply about this matter, that we will forget our political differences and vote only for what we feel is best for America, and other peace-loving people of the world for today and for generations yet unborn.

Mr. Chairman, after much study and consultation with Members on both sides of the aisle, we concluded that the Jensen amendment could not be so drawn as to properly fit into this armed services appropriation bill, due primarily to the present uncertain strained world condition. Then on yesterday, we tentatively agreed that an amendment would be offered that would provide for a limitation of 500,000 white-collar civilian clerical personnel, instead of the approximate 641,765, provided for in this bill, which is a ratio of 1 clerical office civilian for each 5½ persons in uniform, that ratio is all out of proportion, for at the peak of the war, June 1945, the ratio was only 1 to 15.

Now it appears quite certain that a so-called watch dog committee will, within the next week be instituted by House action with sufficient staff, whose duty it will be to make complete audits and investigations as to the need for civilian office personnel and to ferret out waste of money and manpower of every nature. It is hoped the Senate will have the benefit of such investigative report in

time to give proof for a reduction in civilian personnel and great dollar savings as against those provided in this bill. Consequently, I now understand no amendment to reduce civilian personnel will be offered to this bill.

I have collected much factual data relating to civilian employees, and so forth, in the armed services. I shall now read some of that data into the RECORD for all interested Members of Congress and the American people to read, for the benefit of all, I hope:

National Military Establishment, civilian and military personnel, 1939-51

Year (as of June 30)	Civilian employment			Uniformed personnel
	Total	Industrial ¹	White collar	
1939.....	195,285	63,162	132,123	341,000
1940.....	254,822	66,210	188,612	471,000
1941.....	563,686	111,098	452,488	1,819,000
1942.....	1,274,524	490,000	784,524	3,917,000
1943.....	1,982,186	1,165,999	816,187	9,201,000
1944.....	2,339,029	1,375,000	964,029	11,616,000
1945.....	2,634,058	1,467,000	1,167,058	12,295,091
1946.....	1,439,192	960,447	498,745	3,022,870
1947.....	861,645	553,403	308,242	1,572,971
1948.....	871,746	552,534	319,212	1,443,290
1949.....	884,728	541,273	343,455	1,637,000
1950.....	753,149	440,897	312,252	1,487,000
1951.....	1,235,601	739,044	496,557	3,500,000

¹ Figures on industrial employment from 1939 through 1945 are partially estimated.

² May 1950.

³ Authorized strength; actual figure classified.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, IN CONNECTION WITH MONTHLY PERSONNEL REPORT BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NON-ESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES (WITH SPECIAL TABLE ON PUBLICITY PAYROLL COSTS IN THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT)

Civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government increased in May for the 11th consecutive month. The increase was at the rate of more than 1,000 a day, and the total employment reached 2,443,076.

The net increase during the month was 33,955—with 25,196 civilians added to the payrolls of the Military Establishment, and 8,759 additions to the payrolls of civilian agencies.

More than half of the increase was in so-called white-collar rolls, while 15,836 were added to industrial rolls for work in navy yards, arsenals, etc. Of the total Federal employment during May, 757,600 were employed for industrial type work and 1,685,476 were white-collar employees.

Of the total employment, 2,271,444 were assigned to duty stations within continental United States and 171,632 were assigned abroad.

Among the civilian agencies, major increases were reported by the Department of Agriculture, Interior Department, Economic Stabilization Agency, National Production Authority, General Services Administration and Tennessee Valley Authority. Major decreases were reported by the Post Office Department which was still employing more than a half million, and the Veterans' Administration which was still employing 184,373.

These figures were compiled today from monthly personnel statements submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures.

MILITARY PUBLICITY PAYROLL COSTS

This monthly employment compilation by the committee includes a special table showing that the Department of Defense and its components—the Army, Navy and Air Force Departments, and Office of the Secretary of

Defense—this year is using 3,022 civilians and uniformed persons in advertising, publicity and public relations jobs at a payroll cost of \$10,109,109, and that in the new fiscal year, beginning July 1, it is proposed to increase the number in these jobs to 3,825, at a payroll cost of \$13,406,015.

Included among those employed in this type of work this year are 2,235 military (uniformed) personnel, and estimates show the number of military (uniformed) personnel to be employed in advertising, publicity and public relations work next fiscal year is to be increased to 2,941. Civilians would be increased from 787 this year to 884 next year.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, VIRGINIA, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NON-ESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, RELATIVE TO CIVILIAN PERSONNEL DURING THE MONTH OF JUNE, FISCAL YEAR 1951, AND A LETTER FROM MRS. ROSENBERG

Agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government wound up the fiscal year in June with 2,486,755 civilian employees on the payroll and with a civilian payroll running at an annual rate of approximately \$8,500,000,000.

During the month of June the increase totaled 43,649, of whom 27,952 were civilian employees added by the Military Establishment and 15,697 by civilian agencies.

Among the civilian agencies principal increases were reported by the Department of Agriculture with 5,523, Interior Department with 3,260, Economic Stabilization Agency with 2,532, State Department with 1,374, Justice Department with 1,219, Tennessee Valley Authority with 747, General Services Administration with 678, and Federal Security Agency with 517. Major decreases were reported by the Veterans' Administration with 1,542 and the Treasury Department with 503.

HALF-MILLION INCREASE IN FISCAL YEAR

The increase during the year ending June 30 totaled 517,815, of whom 482,452 civilian employees were added to the Military Establishment and 35,363 by civilian agencies.

These figures were revealed today in the monthly compilation of personnel reports certified by the 70 reporting agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures.

LETTERS FROM MRS. ROSENBERG

In connection with the increase in civilian employment by the Military Establishment, which during the year averaged more than 1,300 a day, I am today in receipt of the following letter from Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Personnel:

"HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD,

"Chairman, Joint Committee on Nonessential Federal Expenditures, United States Senate.

"DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am enclosing a copy of a Department of Defense directive which I know will be of interest to you. This directive is in line with our increased activities for more effective utilization of military and civilian personnel, and incorporates the following major features:

"1. Establishes a ceiling for all military and civilian personnel in departmental activities in the Washington area at the strengths actually on board on July 20, 1951. Included are the departmental activities of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, as well as those in the various boards and activities supporting the Secretary of Defense.

"2. Within the next 90 days, each military department and the agencies of the Office of the Secretary of Defense must achieve a 5-percent reduction in both military and civilian strengths within the departmental activities referred to above. These reduc-

tions will be accomplished through normal attrition or turn-over, insofar as practicable, rather than through arbitrary reductions in force.

"3. Military personnel will not be used to replace civilian personnel, nor shall we permit the intent of this directive to be circumvented by the use of temporary duty, detail of individuals from field activities (either within or outside of the Washington area), or by any similar actions.

"In order to insure that any civilian personnel reductions be implemented in an honest and efficient manner, I should like to point out that the Secretaries of the military departments have been specifically charged with the responsibility of surveying their activities and effecting this reduction by selected activity, rather than across the board, and in a manner calculated to cause the minimum interference with essential activities. I have personally discussed this aspect with the Secretaries and Chiefs of Staff, and emphasized the necessity for making this cut in those activities where cuts would be least disruptive.

"I wish to point out that the above step is, in my judgment, only the most recent evidence of the Department's sincere desire and continuing efforts to effect economy in the use of personnel. The savings in our end fiscal year 1951 civilian employment brought about by the establishment of manpower ceilings within the budgetary ceilings are an example of these efforts.

"Striking evidence is also available respecting economy in the use of military personnel. Through improved utilization, the Army expects to obtain two or three more divisions than were originally planned without increasing its requested end fiscal year 1952 strength of 1,552,000.

"I believe that these savings illustrate the Department's adherence to the principle that budgetary ceilings should not be thought of as floors, and that they should be treated as a limit, not a goal.

"We will continue to exert every effort to achieve maximum economy in the use of all Defense Department personnel and we will appreciate your continuing interest and cooperation toward that end.

"Sincerely yours,

"ANNA M. ROSENBERG."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY].

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Coudert]. I am as jealous of the authority of Congress as any man here. I am as reluctant to delegate power to other groups as any man in this Chamber. The suggestion of the gentleman from New York is an excellent one, but I am afraid that it is not practical in this instance.

Congress has approved the sending of American soldiers as occupation troops to Germany and to Austria. Under article 2 of NATO which organization has been approved by Congress the Defense Department is sending troops to join with our friends in Europe for the defense of the industry and the natural resources of that great economy—which, of course, is in the interest and for the defense of the United States. The gentleman from New York said that under article 5 of the NATO agreement that if any member of the NATO organization were attacked then we could send additional troops to Europe. Suppose the attack comes through Austria and Germany, neither of whom are members of this organization? Is the

gentleman from New York willing to allow American lives to be sacrificed and for those lands to be taken over by the enemy until he reaches some country in the NATO agreement? Is he willing for American troops to be out on the end of a limb and give opportunity to the enemy to saw that limb off? I remember that between World War I and World War II France built the great Maginot line. France had a fixed and known policy. What did the German troops do? They walked around the end of it; they did not even try to attack it.

We do not want any fixed policy when the lives of our American boys are at stake. We want to be in a position to defend our troops, to reinforce them as well as provide them with materials, should an emergency require it. We need an open and an elastic policy, and open-mindedness in our leadership. As far as I am concerned, I am not willing to abandon these boys that we are sending to Europe by saying to them, "You are going to have to do the best you can until the Congress can be called together to decide whether or not it is going to send you any reinforcements." I am not willing to have another Corregidor. As one of the gentlemen said a while ago, if we have no faith in the leadership of our Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force, let us replace them; let us get men in whom we do have faith and let us go along with them. I have faith in our military leadership, myself. They consult with us. They are not going to commit troops on their own decision alone. But, let us not bind ourselves to wait and debate when every hour might count. Let us leave the way open to protect our servicemen in foreign lands. I hope this amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of straightening out my own mind on certain of the background that I know the committee has studied most carefully. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he will please tell me: As you deliberated, did any military man recommend any such limitation as is now proposed in this amendment?

Mr. MAHON. In response to the question I should like to say that no military man of any rank, of whom I know, has recommended to the committee, and, insofar as I know, no military man of any rank has recommended to Congress that there be a fixed, legislative limit on the number of troops sent to Europe. Let me say that this statement, insofar as I know, applies across the board to military men in and out of uniform. Let me say that perhaps the man who bears the greatest resentment against this administration and the Joint Chiefs of Staff has unequivocally, so I understand, stated that in his opinion it would be most unwise for Congress to fix any limitations on the number of troops to Europe.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. That, I believe, was General MacArthur.

Mr. MAHON. Another thing that should be made clear to the House is: How many American troops are provided

for our force in Europe in the pending bill? This bill provides pay for about 344,000 United States troops for all of Europe. For the NATO countries it provides for 259,000, which includes six divisions. In addition there are something like 15,000 troops, I believe, in Austria, and by agreement there are about 5,000 troops in Trieste, and in General Eisenhower's headquarters and in other fields of activity there are about 5,000 more, and then there are about 60,000 Air Force troops who are rotated back and forth for training purposes to Europe. The over-all number of troops which General Collins said this morning we might expect in all of Europe during fiscal 1952, according to present plans, is about 344,000, and that is the number which has been given to the House this afternoon by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself, as the result of a brief hearing which was held this morning in order to get the very latest word on this matter.

CONCLUSION

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. As the debate on this amendment has progressed, I have concluded that whatever the purpose behind it and however sincere its proponents may be, still it was definitely not based on sound military judgment.

One who has preceded me suggested that this amendment is the will of the people. I speak only for my own. In their behalf I want to say most emphatically that this would not suit them at all. They have repeatedly, and so far as I can recall unanimously, urged me to vote for any amount necessary for national defense. They are very strong for economy in Government, but they do not want to save dollars at the expense of national security.

I believe that the subcommittee headed by my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. MAHON] has carefully eliminated from this bill, as from all others, every unnecessary item. As they recommend it to us, I believe it is wise, and altogether necessary. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to close debate on the amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, it should be pointed out that we do not have an unlimited number of men in uniform. It should be pointed out that we are providing in this bill, and only Congress can provide for the military force, a force in being during this year, for an Army, Navy, and Air Force of about 3,500,000 people. Of those about 1,500,000 are in the Army. If we denuded the Pacific of troops, if we took them all out of Korea, all out of Japan and the islands of the sea, and all out of the United States and the Caribbean and elsewhere, we could not send to Europe more than 1,500,000 without further congressional action. Nobody would dream of such rash action as that.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have said that we will have, and we substantially have now, six divisions in Europe. There is now no plan to send any more than the

six divisions to Europe. That force is being sent there after the whole matter has been very carefully worked out by the Joint Chiefs. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has read, General Collins, Chief of Staff of the Army, and nobody doubts the integrity or the authority of this man, has said that before any major change is made with respect to sending troops to Europe the appropriate committees of Congress will all be consulted in advance of the time the decision is made. I do not want to send too many American troops to Europe. I wish we did not have to send any. However, I think it would be most unwise to fix a number as a matter of law.

Can you imagine the men in the Kremlin making an edict or passing a law saying "We will not send more than six divisions of Russian troops to the satellite countries and to Eastern Germany without further legislation"? Would the Kremlin contemplate for a moment any such legislation as that, and shout to the world what their plans were? They want to be able to rock with the punches and do what may be required in the twinkling of an eye. I shall not be one to tying the hands of this great country at this most crucial period, perhaps, in our history. I think the majority of the Members of Congress share that resolve.

I was struck with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] when he said, "Let us let the Kremlin worry about what we are going to do." I was pleased to see the applause, which indicated to me that the Members of the House are not going to tell the Kremlin just what the details of our plans are, nor are we going to tie General Eisenhower's hands behind him and say, "We are going to pass a no-confidence vote in you and try to undermine you, General Eisenhower, at the very time when a new spirit is blossoming in Europe and new hope is springing into the hearts of the freemen of the world." No, a thousand times, no. A majority of the Members of Congress will not follow the lead of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COVERT], in this amendment. I respect the gentleman but I cannot concur with his views in offering the amendment.

I think there must be an utter lack of comprehension as to what world war III would probably be like. What would it be like? If such a war should start, which Heaven forbid, there probably would be no time for convening the Congress. There probably would be no declaration of war by the Kremlin. The bombs would begin to fall and whether they would fall here or somewhere else, there will not be any time for debate. Our war plans would have to be executed with the greatest haste. There would not be time to offer amendments and have debates. It is unthinkable to me that the House of Representatives would adopt the pending amendment, especially in the light of all the facts and circumstances. This is no time for timidity. This is no time to say, "We are afraid. We are afraid to say that we will send more than six divisions to Europe." Let us reserve the right to do what seems to be most appropriate as the events of the future unfold. I think

that represents the attitude of the American people. We are confronted with 175 Russian divisions not far from Western Europe. We now have about six divisions there, and let us not tip our hand as to what we might later decide to do in an effort to promote peace and the security of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All the time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 84, noes 131.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 602. Section 3648, Revised Statutes, shall not apply, in the case of payments made from appropriations contained in this act, (1) to payments made in compliance with the laws of foreign countries or their ministerial regulations, (2) to payments for rent in such countries for such periods as may be necessary to accord with local custom, or (3) to payments made for tuition.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, what has been said to the Members of the House by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGLESWORTH], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has given me great concern. I am just about convinced that the Congress of the United States has substantially lost control of the affairs of this country. When men of that type are forced to come into this well and tell us they are unable to get information from the military administrators, that detailed information is not forthcoming, that satisfactory answers to questions are not available, that is something for us to be concerned about. The debate on the amendment which has just failed of approval shows to me the utter confusion, the utter incapacity of the Congress of the United States to further control the affairs of this country. I am forced to the conclusion that much of this is due to the wide scope of our international program, to the various commitments that have been made through our State Department, and those who maneuver our diplomatic operations, and I have simply taken the floor as a means of publicly expressing my views so that the people, in my district at least, will know how I personally feel about it.

I repeat, I think we have substantially lost control of the affairs of this country, irrespective of how that may have occurred.

Here we have a \$56,000,000,000 appropriation bill, with a \$4,500,000,000 portion of the bill to come later, and with anywhere from 15 to 35 billion additional coming up for consideration before this Congress adjourns. We are in a position where no member of the Appropriations Committee, as far as I know, can stand on this floor and make a definite statement that is worth a nickel to anyone who really wants concrete information before voting on the proposition. I refer you to what the men have said. We are forced to accept this bill as it is pre-

sented or vote against all of the appropriations in the bill, and who wants to vote against all of the appropriations in the bill, with the commitments of this country as great as they are.

We had an illustration yesterday when someone brought into the debate the question of the \$307,000,000 for Chiang Kai-shek's government in Formosa, the so-called Nationalist Government of China. We have this perfectly fantastic provision which is in the Japanese Peace Treaty, which gives Japan the right to select one of the two Chinese governments with which it is to do business. It can select the Communist government or it can select the Nationalist government, if that treaty stands as it is now proposed. Suppose Japan selects the Communist government and throws its strength to the proposition of giving Formosa back to Communist China, what are you going to do about that? This \$307,000,000 proposal—and I am informed that that is another one of these leaks; that information should not have got out at all, that it is strictly confidential information; but it is public information and it has been published in the press and therefore we can talk about it, as I view the situation. Here is your over-all foreign aid and defense program, endorsed by all the proper departments of Government. I mean such as the State Department, Treasury Department, ECA, and so on. They endorse the program and then it must be approved by the President. What are the elements or segments in that program, I do not know. There is not any way I can find out. Unless you are a member of a committee where you sit and listen to this confidential information, where you are practically sworn to secrecy, you cannot find out even though you are a Member of Congress. But the over-all program is endorsed by these various departments of Government; and I say this information has come to me from those departments since 8 o'clock this morning, but you are not supposed to know the details, and this \$307,000,000 item was one of the details, but prior to yesterday this item was not public information.

AID TO FORMOSA—THEN FORMOSA TO THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. Chairman, what may become one of the most fantastic proposals in current history is in the process of coming to light. It is alarming, and it may prove dangerous.

The press reports that the administration has asked the Congress to provide \$307,000,000 for an aid program for the Nationalist Chinese forces of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, located on the strategic island of Formosa.

The program includes some \$217,000,000 for arms shipments, reportedly designed to modernize an anti-Communist Chinese Army of between 25 and 30 divisions.

This program, as I understand, is a complete reversal of recent State Department policy. It is more significant and conclusive proof of the fact that the policy of the State Department is inconsistent and bungling, and therefore inimical to the best interests of the United States.

President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and their like-minded colleagues have done much in their power to hinder the Nationalist Chinese forces in the struggle against Mao Tse-tung's Moscow-directed Communist hordes. The Marshall-Stilwell plot to force Chiang off of the Chinese mainland and back to Formosa is well-known history.

In addition, for the past 14 months the United States Seventh Fleet has been located in the waters around Formosa for the express purpose not only of stopping Red aggression onto that island stronghold, but also for stopping any moves Chiang may wish to make against the Communists. The State Department calls this policy "neutralizing" Formosa.

Now, after years of deliberately thwarting Nationalist Chinese efforts to fight the Communists, it appears the State Department has decided to support a money grant for arming the Nationalists.

Included in this proposal, as I have stated, is a \$217,000,000 grant for military assistance. The present Defense Secretary, General Marshall, has consistently and steadfastly opposed aid to Chiang.

After the press announced yesterday that the administration had requested all this money for Chiang, I eagerly awaited a statement from Secretary Marshall. Is he completely reversing his policy, his long-held views, on this subject? Or is he merely going along with Secretary Acheson because Mr. Acheson is running the show in the first place?

No statement was forthcoming.

Through contacting General Marshall's office, Mr. Felix Larkin, general counsel of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, raised the question of secrecy of information. He observed that the testimony about the entire Mutual Security Act was in secret. It appears someone leaked the information about China, or else it would still not be public.

Mr. Larkin declined to answer the direct question:

Is General Marshall now supporting this money request for Chiang, or isn't he?

Instead, Mr. Larkin said:

The whole program under the proposed military aid under title 3 in the Mutual Security Act bill is classified information, and the Department of Defense has no comment on any stories that were in the papers today.

The news is out that the administration wants money for Chiang. All I want to know is what any citizen in Michigan or any other place is entitled to know: Is General Marshall for this \$307,000,000 proposal, or is he against it?

No answer. The information is secret. The Congress is being asked for the money, but the views of the Secretary of Defense cannot be given to a Member of Congress.

Mr. Bray, Deputy Assistant Director of Policy and Planning, International Security Affairs, State Department, observed this morning that the money for Nationalist China is but one item in the entire Mutual Security Act, and that the State Department is officially supporting the act.

But Mr. Bray's statement clearly indicates that the State Department—which means Secretary Acheson—has reversed its policy with respect to Chiang.

I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if it is not significant that the State Department's reversal of policy comes less than a month before the Japanese peace treaty is to be signed—September 4, in San Francisco.

As I pointed out in a lengthy statement on the House floor on August 2, there is a sleeper clause in the Japanese peace treaty which, in effect, might hand over Formosa to the Chinese Communists—the men who are this very moment slaughtering our fellow Americans on the tough battlefields of Korea.

There is a provision in this treaty which says that the Japanese Government, when it later gets around to making its peace treaty with China, can choose which Chinese government it will consider legitimate. Japan may deal with the Communist or the Nationalist Chinese Government.

Given that choice, Japan, on account of obvious trade advantages, is likely to choose Communist China.

If Japan deals with Communist China, it is most likely that Formosa will be handed over to Communist China, for Communist China would occupy the place of the victor at the diplomatic table, and Communist China's longing for Formosan soil is well known.

I do not say authoritatively that Japan will choose to deal with Communist China, but it is quite obvious that is more likely to be her choice. These are not "calculated risks"—these are strong possibilities which the security of the United States cannot afford to risk.

May I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that you consider these two issues side by side, in relation to each other.

On the one hand we see the State Department suddenly reversing its anti-Chiang stand, and urging an appropriation of tax dollars to help his government; on the other hand we have the very same State Department—supporting a peace treaty which opens the door wide for Formosa to fall into Communist clutches.

This policy indicates one or both of two things: Either the State Department is so utterly confused, and bewildered, and has spread itself so far that it cannot in one limited area of the globe permit its left hand to know what its right hand is doing; or else, the State Department is in the direction of handing over \$307,000,000 in American money or goods to the Communists, along with the island of Formosa, a vital defense barrier in the far Pacific.

On previous occasions the United States has been more or less sold out by the plotters of the State Department. The disgraces of Yalta, Tehran, Potsdam, and Cairo are recent memories. Our secret agreements giving Russia control of Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, Port Arthur, Dairen, and the Sakhalin and Kurile Islands are parts of this betrayal. The deal giving Russia industrialized Manchuria is not yet forgotten—Manchuria, which the North Korean Communists now use as a sanctuary

from which to attack our American and South Korean troops.

The errors made in these agreements and secret deals will not soon be forgotten—we still pay for them dearly in American lives and American money.

Mr. Chairman, it is past time somebody took note of this matter. I call upon the Committee on Foreign Affairs to carefully consider the State Department's proposal.

If the American people cannot rely on the State Department to look after American interests, it becomes the obligation of the Congress to take the initiative.

Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to extend my remarks so that I may put in the RECORD some of the information I have picked up today and which was not given to me in confidence, and which further deals with this Japanese treaty proposal and this \$307,000,000 item.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], and in disagreement with him, yet having profound respect for his views, and with others with whom I may be in disagreement—and I hope they have respect for my views when they disagree with me—I cannot permit the remarks of my friend to go unanswered. In my opinion, the majority of the House of Representatives in the Committee of the Whole on the vote just taken have made a very powerful and constructive contribution toward the ultimate objective which we all have in mind.

As I said here, my mind goes back before Pearl Harbor when those of us who advocated measures to prepare in case of attack were fighting a rearguard action. At that time public opinion emotionally aroused was against any affirmative measures. Fortunately the public opinion of America today is very strongly in favor of the Congress and our country taking strong measures in order to meet the dastardly challenge that confronts the world today. Public opinion today is entirely changed from what it was 11 years ago, and I think the people of America generally are far ahead of many of us who are Members of Congress, in recognition of the danger and in their recognition, in fact, insistence, that we take all steps necessary to develop our power: First, to be prepared for attack in case it comes; and second, as a deterrent for any attack, because our people recognize the fact that the only thing that the Communist rulers and others obsessed with such a dastardly disease, destructive beyond imagination, is what they fear, and that is power greater than they possess. I think the Committee of the Whole in its wisdom acted properly in voting against the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]—and I respect him. I would have him understand that I think his views and his motives are noble and high-minded, but I think the major-

ity of the Committee of the Whole acted wisely in rejecting the amendment, because the adoption of the amendment might have had harmful results throughout the world. You notice I said "results." Results not intended, but we have got to consider results which might flow from an act just as well as the intent that might be involved.

In view of the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan, I take the floor so that the RECORD will show, speaking for those who voted against the amendment, and I refer to Members on both sides of the aisle—Republicans voted against it as well as Democrats—they acted wisely in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. As majority leader of the House—I have said this before and I repeat it now—I am proud, very proud, of the high level of debate that the membership of the House has engaged in on this bill and has engaged in on bills of all nature, particularly those relating to our foreign affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, there are controversial issues, I recognize that, and within them there are controversial questions, but the membership of the House, and I refer to Members on both sides of the aisle, have always engaged in a very high level of debate in expressing the views as they entertained them and have acted in a manner which we of today can be proud when the historians of tomorrow might read about our debates.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I want to thank the gentleman for his kind words.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, they are honest words.

Mr. COUDERT. I appreciate that. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. The gentleman is pleased that the House has refrained from imposing any legal restrictions on the military to move troops abroad?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a fair way of putting it.

Mr. COUDERT. Is the gentleman, as majority leader of this House, in a position to give assurance to the Members of the House that no more than six divisions will be sent abroad to the NATO army to implement article 3 without approval of the Congress?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, the gentleman from Massachusetts is in no position to give any assurance, and if anybody informed the gentleman from Massachusetts that he had authority to give such assurance, the gentleman from Massachusetts, as an American and as a Member of Congress, in light of world conditions, would object to any such

promises or instructions, and I would vigorously fight them. Our military leaders are human beings, but they are men, and we have to look to them in this emergency, and in case of war we will have to look to them to lead our Army, our Navy, our Air Force, and our Marine Corps. As an American, as a Member of Congress, I am in no position where I can very well challenge their views and I have got to repose confidence in them.

Mr. COUDERT. That means, then, that the gentleman is entirely satisfied to permit the military to send a million men abroad?

Mr. McCORMACK. Within the military field. I recognize the importance of their judgment and I recognize that we have got to turn to them within military fields and receive their judgment. We should give full and complete recognition to these men who have given their entire life in the military service of our country, and respond to the positions of leadership and to the success of our country in case of war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is a very frank admission that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], our majority leader, has made. As I heard it, as I understand it, and he sits here—and correct me if I am in error—it means this and no more than this: That the destiny of our Nation, so far as he is concerned and so far as the Congress is concerned, has been turned over and put in the hands of the military men. That is what it amounts to if you will read it tomorrow and if it goes into the RECORD as he said it.

I do not subscribe to that doctrine at all. We need no military dictatorship in this country to win the present or any other war—dictatorship by an Eisenhower, a Marshall, a Rosenberg, a State Department, or an Acheson. The Congress of the United States has some responsibility on the question of whether we declare war, whether we fight a war, and when and where we fight it, and for what purpose. I just cannot and I will not go along with the idea that the military men or the Secretary of State or the Department of State are to take over my responsibility or are to speak for me. They, and I mean the Marshall-Acheson group under Truman, have gotten us into this mess, into this war.

I remember the argument that was made before Pearl Harbor, and to which the gentleman referred. And, what was it? That every time we were asked to appropriate a dollar or enact legislation, we were told by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], by the Committee on Foreign Relations, yes, and by some Republican members of that—by the Deweys, the Stassens—that the purpose was to keep us out of war. And, all the time the real underlying effect was to get us into war. And that is what has been done this time.

Once again we are fighting, will continue to fight, if some have their way—to protect England's trade dollars. This bill today carries \$56,000,000,000, and much of it will be used for the success of the Democratic ticket in 1952. Now, like it or not, it will be, and you know it will, and a lot of the legislation that has been passed and many a dollar that has been appropriated has been used for that purpose. Why do I say that? Because of the experience we had before. I have not forgotten when Federal money was passed out in Pennsylvania to the farmers at the polls, and they were told where their interest was, who buttered their bread—but no one claimed any credit for sending their sons to fight abroad. Now it is the same old story: Frighten the people, get us into a war, and then come along under the guise of national defense and ask for billions more. Billions for the Armed Forces to spend to fight the wars, defend ourselves in the wars in which the United States or Acheson may involve us. Read the editorial in the Saturday Evening Post this week. I have often wondered why it is that the fellow who is so close to the soil, who by some standards knows so little, who never has had a college or university education, is always in the forefront, is the first when it comes to recognizing the truth. Read that editorial. Here is a professor of the University of Chicago, Dr. Hans J. Morgenthau, a distinguished scholar, who takes the time to write a book, yes, a whole book to tell us what Castle-reagh, Palmerston, John Hay, Queen Elizabeth, Bismarck, yes, and every American who ever earned his own living by growing food out of Mother Earth, or by working in mill, mine, or factory, or behind a counter has always known, that self-preservation is the first law of nature followed by man and nation if survival be the purpose. And what was it this great scholar took a book to tell us? Something our internationalists, our do-gooders never learn. That every nation in the world, from the beginning of history down to today except the United States, has always followed a policy which had, as its primary objective purpose, the welfare of its people, the interest, the advancement and security of that nation.

The doctor's main thesis, as stated by the Post, is that our policy both for Europe and for Asia should not be ideological, theological, or sentimental but should promote the security and interest of the United States. How absurd, how narrow that thought must be to our internationalists, to some of the members of our Committee on Foreign Relations—but it is a thought—it is truth which is in the mind of every sound-thinking American. The Post editor concludes with this:

In other words, it is idiotic to talk about defense of morality (and I might add, the freedom of other nations) if that means stripping ourselves, by aimless dispersions of power, of the ability to defend anything.

Now, I ask you, read that editorial and, if you have time, read the book, and then see if you have learned anything that you did not know before—had you

paused to think—which was, and which is today, that it is our duty to think first of our people, of our country, and not of these other nations, whose burdens we have been carrying and will always carry as long as we are willing and they can induce us to do so.

When you have read the editorial and the book you will not have learned anything you did not know before, which has not, from the well of the House where I am now speaking, been said over and over again by some of us. Neither the majority of the Congress nor the administration would listen and today we are in world war III, forced to appropriate \$56,000,000,000 as part payment on our folly.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read, that it be open for amendment, and that points of order be reserved.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair makes inquiry whether there are any points of order to any of the remaining sections of the bill.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that we should dispose of the points of order first. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against section 628 of the bill, page 63, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, this section places a limitation on expenditures in an appropriation bill. From the viewpoint of the committee, it is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard further on his point of order?

Mr. TEAGUE. It is true that the first few lines of the section do impose a limitation, but I think it is also obvious and true that the latter part of the section changes the basic law and imposes legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be pleased to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the provision is a clear limitation and it is not new legislation. There is no new legislation in it. The provisos are specific and do not require additional duties. It is a clear limitation within the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Texas makes a point of order against section 628 of the bill on the ground that it contains legislation.

The Chair is of the opinion that while the section purports to be a limitation on the appropriation it does, especially

in the language beginning on page 63, lines 16, 17, and 18, impose additional duties and responsibilities upon the Secretary of Defense. The Chair is therefore of the opinion that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and sustains the point of order.

Are there further points of order?

If there are no further points of order, the Chair will recognize Members who have amendments at the Clerk's desk. First, however, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] to strike out the last word.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize the spirit of the House at this time, and I hesitate to impose myself further on your good nature.

A Member of Congress can afford to give up many things, but he cannot afford to give up his self-respect. I have been a little disturbed by some of the intimations which have been made to the effect that nobody knows what is in this bill, that we had to vote for it blindly because we were afraid not to vote for it, the issue of national defense being involved. I hope the fact that members of the subcommittee have been critical of some of the operations of the Department of Defense has not misled the House. The fact that we have been critical and have singled out various instances of bad management and waste should indicate to Members of the House that a very thorough and careful study has been made of the whole military program. It was upon the basis of this careful probing that various reductions were made in the bill. As I have said before, we devoted 11 long weeks to hearings on this bill.

It was because of the work of the committee that various conclusions have been reached and various suggestions have been made. Our studies led to numerous recommendations in the committee report which is available to the House, and numerous reductions in the interest of efficiency.

Now, there is no reason not to be realistic. It is utterly impossible for any man in Congress or in the Department of Defense to know everything about the far-flung ramifications of the defense program and of defense spending. The program is so big that no human brain would be capable of grasping every detail and fact associated with so gigantic an effort. This is not a confession of weakness on the part of Congress; it is simply a statement of human limitations.

Yet no Member need say that he knows nothing about this bill. It would be most ridiculous and absurd, and it would certainly be a confession of lack of diligence for him to say that he knew nothing about this bill. Obviously, all Members know something about the bill; but, of course, it is perfectly understandable that Members generally, in fact, no Member could possibly know every minute detail of a \$56,000,000,000 military program.

I hold in my hand 3,500 pages of printed testimony containing more information about this legislation than has perhaps been given about any other

bill at this session of Congress. The report contains a wealth of information with respect to every major phase of defense spending.

Of course, you cannot predict everything that will happen on your farm or in your business or in the Government or in the Department of Defense in advance but, certainly, if there ever was information available about any bill that has ever been considered by the Congress in its history, there is information available about this bill. Again I say here are 3,500 pages of information that is available and here is the report which has been available to Members for several days. Why should Members make reference to unfamiliarity with respect to over-all defense spending when we have such voluminous information which is available? Moreover, the bill itself consists of 65 pages. Certainly, those who complain that they know nothing about the bill have certainly read the bill itself very carefully, and have studied it.

Let Members also remember that those sturdy Americans, those rugged individualists who refuse to move from a position when they think they are right—let them remember that such men as JOHN TABER, RICHARD WIGGLESWORTH, ERRETT SCRIVNER, HARRY SHEPPARD, BOB SIKES, and JOHN RILEY, worked for weeks and months in the preparation of this bill. Of course, none of us is fully satisfied with the measure, but do you think the committee would have come in with the bill unless people like that knew something about it?

There is no easy way to find out what you are going to do, Mr. Chairman, with \$56,000,000,000. You have to work hard and long and burn the midnight oil.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman knows the affection I hold for him. He has just made a statement that all Members of the House ought to know what is in this bill because they have had the opportunity of reading a report which the gentleman just said took his subcommittee 11 weeks to complete.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How in the name of heaven can you expect the average Member, in a few short hours, to master that which has taken you 11 weeks of hearings to produce? It is an impossibility, and it is unfair to expect any Member of the House to be able to do it.

Mr. MAHON. I do not think it is possible for every Member of the House to know fully what is in the bill. All Members are very busy with heavy responsibilities and they cannot possibly read all committee hearings. I think our committee system more or less takes care of that situation. There is no abler Member of the House than my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, and I am in no way critical of him or any other Member.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then, let us not criticize them.

Mr. MAHON. Oh, no, I am in no way critical—of course, it is impossible for Members to read all committee hearings of various committees. My point was

that Members who sought more information about the pending measure could get a fairly good picture by scanning the hearings and reading essential parts of the report.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the Members had 11 weeks to review that which has taken you 11 weeks to produce, I think perhaps most of them might know as much about it as the gentleman knows, but we have not had 11 weeks.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. No; Members have not had 11 weeks and, unfortunately, I do not know of any way that Members could have had that much time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then, please do not hold us responsible.

Mr. MAHON. I think Members are doing the best they can with a very difficult situation. The 158-page report does give them a good source of information, but I have no desire to discount the difficulties.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT:

Page 52, line 9, insert "(a)" after "SEC. 604."

On page 52, insert after line 11 the following new matter:

"(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this act for 'Pay and allowances' of military personnel shall be expended for the pay or allowances, accruing after November 30, 1951, of any member of the Inactive or Volunteer Reserve who served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more in any branch of the Armed Forces during the period beginning December 7, 1941, and ending September 2, 1945, if such member shall have served on active duty for a period of 12 months or more after June 26, 1950, unless such member shall have voluntarily consented to remain on active duty."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but I will reserve it until the gentleman has concluded his remarks.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, on the 7th day of June, when we considered the conference report on the Senate bill No. 1, now Public Law 51, we found that the conferees had agreed to a period of 17 months of active duty on the part of Inactive and Volunteer Reserves who had been called to active duty involuntarily against their own wishes.

As a matter of information, when the House approved Senate bill No. 1, commonly called the UMT bill, it provided that the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves called to active duty against their own wishes would be required to serve 12 months. The Senate bill, when it passed the Senate, did not contain any provision whatsoever. So the conferees recommended the 17 months period of service. During the debate the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services [Mr. VINSON] stated that in a few weeks the Department of Defense would send to the House Committee on Armed Services a bill providing a new Reserve policy and that it would be certain to correct any injustice that was being done to the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves. The House Committee on

Armed Services has received that bill, and there is nothing in it that will correct any injustice which has been done to the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is a member of the committee that is now conducting hearings on that bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Is there anything that will prohibit him from carrying out the statement I made, that we could correct it in the Reserve bill, which the gentleman is holding hearings on now?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I can reply to your question by saying that the bill you have in mind may not reach the floor of the House for possibly a month and it may not pass the Senate for another month. In the meantime these Inactive and Volunteer Reserves are being retained on active duty.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to do is provide relief to a group of Americans who served during World War II for more than 12 months, and who joined the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves of our Armed Forces with the understanding they would not be called except in case of war. Unknown to these Inactive and Volunteer Reserves, the Congress of the United States amended the Selective Service Act of 1948 and provided that not only would their enlistment be extended for a period of 12 months, but they could be called up to active duty. Mind you these Inactive and Volunteer Reserves attended no drills, received no summer training, or pay. They were literally reservists on paper. When Mrs. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of National Defense, appeared before the House Committee on Armed Services she confessed that the law had been administered poorly. She confessed that the Department of Defense had treated the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves of this country in a shameful manner. Yet they are still on active duty, and there is no Member of this House who has not received a letter, or numerous letters, telling him about the discrimination that the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves have been subjected to in being separated from his family, his civilian occupation, or his business while Organized Reserves who attend summer training and weekly drills and receive pay for them remain at home with thousands of young men of draft age walking the streets.

Mr. Chairman, what does my amendment do? It provides that on the 30th day of November, 24 days before Christmas, because of the fact that no portion of this appropriation can be used to pay a Volunteer or Inactive Reserve who has had more than 12 months of active duty he must be separated and returned to inactive duty. I say to the members of this committee, if you want to recognize a group of Americans who have already made their contribution in World War II, and who are being forced to make another contribution in world war III—and I consider the Korean war world war III—and if you want to help the Reserves in the future, I urge that you pass this amendment and return these

boys to their homes for Christmas Day 1951.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. How does this help the reserves, by cutting off their pay?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It means that the armed services will have to return them to inactive duty by November 30, because they cannot be retained on active duty without pay.

Mr. COOLEY. That does not necessarily have to follow. I think the gentleman's purpose is right, but to cut off a man's pay seems to be a very awkward way of accomplishing what he desires.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is the only way it can be done. As I mentioned previously we tried to correct the intolerable conditions when the UMT conference report was on the floor but because of the parliamentary situation amendments were barred.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment would be to repeal a provision in the Draft Act.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Not necessarily.

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly the effect of it, because the result is that it will force the Department to do either one of two things: Turn them out in 12 months or hold them without pay.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. They will not hold them because, under existing law, military personnel ordered to active duty must be in a pay status.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If it has the effect of repealing that provision in the Draft Act, it ought to be done, anyway.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Definitely so.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I am entirely in sympathy with the objective that the gentleman has in mind, but I wonder if he can tell the committee what effect this would have on the armed services as of today—whether it would release so many men that it would make many of the units of the armed services impotent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. When I considered introducing my amendment I took that into consideration, and that is the reason for establishing the date of November 30. At the present time there is a rotation program under way. There is, in addition, a program providing for the release of reserves under this program. They are releasing so many thousands every month. Among those released are inactive and volunteer reserves. Therefore, on November 30 a great majority of inactive and volunteer reserves who were called during July and August of last year will be released under the 17-month provision which is a maximum, and not a minimum, period of service.

It is now August 9 and we are giving the armed services nearly 4

months' notice to call up paid reservists and draftees to replace the inactive and the volunteer reservists. Therefore, the results of my amendment in returning to inactive duty the inactive and volunteer reserve will in no manner disrupt the Armed Forces of our country. It will, however, in a small measure let the inactive and the volunteer reserves know that Congress recognizes the shameful treatment accorded them and is making a ninth-inning attempt to correct a situation that should have never developed.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I had reserved a point of order against the amendment, but it seems to be clearly a limitation on the pay of certain military personnel and I think it is not subject to a point of order. I therefore withdraw the point of order.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the point of order is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be recognized in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will vote down this amendment.

The question propounded by the distinguished hero from Wake Island was very pertinent. This amendment would have the effect absolutely of practically destroying a great many elements, particularly in the Navy.

I offered this amendment in the committee when we were considering the draft bill because I was very anxious to do what was right and proper for the inactive and voluntary reservists, and I fixed the period of service at 12 months.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman's amendment was not the one that was approved by the House; the one that was approved by the House was the one offered by the gentleman from New Jersey now interrogating the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. TOWE. The gentleman's amendment provided that they be turned out if it was convenient to do so.

Mr. VINSON. That is right. I withdraw that statement and give the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TOWE] full credit, but the issue was brought up in the committee at my suggestion.

Admiral Sherman pointed out that to do what is proposed by that amendment would completely destroy a great many units in the Navy; it would be utterly impossible to administer without great military damage. So when we went to conference we reached the decision to limit their length of service to 17 months, and the services are trying to get out the Inactive Reserves now. If you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania the effect would

be to force out immediately every one of the inactive and voluntary reservists who are now in service because the Army could not pay them, the Navy could not pay them, the Air Force could not pay them; and, certainly, therefore, you could not hold them involuntarily in the Armed Services.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman will certainly agree that there are literally thousands of Organized Reserves who have not yet been called, and who are receiving drill pay and expect to be called.

Mr. VINSON. That is true.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Why were they not called instead of the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman understands my position on that. I think the services made a mistake in not calling first the Organized Reserves instead of the Voluntary Reserves. By what this here would do is force the Departments to turn reserves out immediately, within 12 months; and the effect of it would be that half of your Army would come out of Korea, half of it would come out of Germany, and a large number of reserves would have to come out of the Navy. So I trust this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The interim report submitted to the Congress by the Brooks subcommittee shows that as of April 1, 1951, there was a total of 650,000 reserves on active duty and the majority of them are represented by the National Guard divisions, and the Organized Reserve units of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps leaving literally only a handful of individuals called to active duty from the Inactive and Volunteer Reserves.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is a member of a subcommittee that I appointed, headed by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks], to make a study of the reserve program, and this question should be dealt with in that legislation. The gentleman has ample opportunity to offer an amendment in the committee and to bring the proposal back to the House in proper form.

I certainly trust you will not force the Department to do one of two things: Either hold them by the back of the neck or else take them and turn them loose after the 12 months is out. This amendment will destroy your services; you will destroy a great many units of your Navy if you adopt the Van Zandt amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there any way we can tell the ultimate effect of this amendment?

Mr. VINSON. Yes; you can predict the ultimate effect of this amendment; it will take out of the service every man who is a volunteer or inactive reservist who served 12 months; you would take hundreds of thousands out almost by tomorrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, this is one amendment I am very happy to support. This matter has been a terrible headache to me since last August. I have had over 75 requests from young fellows who had just established themselves in civilian life after paying the price during many years of service in World War II, leaving families behind, leaving obligations behind and suffering undue hardships.

My experience has not been a happy one with the three military services. When Members here say that we are going to wreck the Army, Navy, and Air Force by the withdrawal of these inactive reservists, I do not think they can sustain that position. I remember well the arguments advanced by the Committee on Military Affairs when this was introduced as a part of the Selective Service Act. We were pacified by lip service here that something would be done about it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Neither the Army nor the Defense Department intends to call any replacements and they do not intend to carry out the rotation system until this Congress makes them do it. I know of no better way than through this amendment.

Mr. WIER. I appreciate the gentleman's support. This is the experience I am running into so far as the Army, Navy, and Air Force are concerned. They were lenient during the months of June and July. They had a program outlined for the release of inactive reservists and they began to release them. The number involved is nowhere near enough to destroy any army we have, any division we have or any corps we have. The Army, Navy, and Air Force have admitted this should be done and they have submitted the figures as to those who would be discharged beginning in May, June, July, August, and September.

What has happened? I go down to the Navy or Army now with a request for the discharge of an inactive reservist. They say: "No, we reserve the right to extend it another year." That is the position they are taking now, reserving another year of service for these inactive reservists, beginning in November of this year.

I hope that the House does adopt this amendment because we will put the military authorities on their sincerity in the Selective Service Act with regard to release of the inactive reservists, and this is the only way you are going to get them out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I was the one who offered the amendment to the Selective Service Act having to do with inactive and volunteer veteran reservists which was adopted by the House. When that bill went to conference, despite assurances on the part of the managers of the House, that the 12-months period of service would be retained, it

came back to the House with an increase to 17 months. That is further proof that administration leaders have been playing political football with the inactive and volunteer veteran reservists. This amendment will stop at least some of the rotten abuses that have been heaped on the Reserves.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. TOWE. Not only was it increased to 17 months but they reinserted the provision that was in the original committee bill that they would be turned out if it suited the pleasure of the Defense Department. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that the only way the Defense Establishment will ever do this job properly and turn men out who ought to be turned out is for this amendment or a similar one to be adopted. I hope the pending amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from New Jersey is, as usual, expressing his real interest in the servicemen of this country, and I commend him.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, author of the amendment and another member of the House Armed Services Committee who does more than give lip service to our servicemen.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It has been said here that this will wreck our national defense. It will not. Let me point out that the majority of the Reserves in active duty today are represented by the National Guard divisions, by the aviation units and by other units that have been called up. The Inactive and Volunteer Reserve represents the individual who has been called to active duty without his consent. I daresay there are not more than 150,000 of them in the services today.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I want to assure the gentleman from Iowa that my views are in entire accord with those of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. In fact, I offered an amendment to the recently enacted military manpower bill that would have helped Inactive and Volunteer Reserves to a great extent. That amendment should have been passed and this amendment should be likewise adopted at the present time.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Michigan, a veteran of World War II.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to read one brief statement from the Brooks subcommittee report which was made recently and which followed an investigation of the recall and release of reservists.

There can be no doubt that the Department of Defense is well aware of the foregoing for Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, in an exchange of remarks with Congressman DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, before the

Armed Services Committee, said as follows:

Secretary ROSENBERG. When the last World War ended, Congressman SHORT, men took on an obligation to enter an active Reserve component. Those men have been paid for their training and in normal times they are the men to be called after the regular armed services. I agree with you 100 percent, the men called have been the ones on the inactive Reserve and not the ones on the active Reserve.

Then the subcommittee, taking note of the long train of abuses of the reservists, said this:

A partial rectification for the errors can be made by an early release of all reservists serving on active duty involuntarily.

Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what this amendment seeks to accomplish. It is impossible for me to understand how Mr. VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, can oppose this amendment which seeks only to carry out a recommendation of one of his own subcommittees. Decent treatment for the Reserves is long overdue. I certainly hope this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] to close debate.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, there is no question but what the volunteer and the inactive reservists have had pretty tough sledding; there is no question about that. However, this is a poor place to make a change in policy. This is an appropriation measure, not a legislative measure. An opportunity was provided during the consideration of the Draft Act for a change in policy to be made. It was not made. The inactive reservists and the volunteer reservists are in the process of being taken out of the services rather rapidly, even more rapidly than the law requires, but because of the fact that we have an established policy as the result of already established law, the services have been built up to a certain level, dependent in part on the services of the Inactive Reserves and the Volunteer Reserves. As much as I sympathize I fear that their services will have to be used if we are to continue to operate our military units efficiently and if we are to continue to win battles. I think we can put it as plainly as that. These men are being replaced just as fast as the trainees can be prepared to take their places. In a few months, I believe this amendment would be much less injurious, and I think it would have my support. But we are facing a very serious situation and these men know that the safety of their own loved ones may be at stake. Certainly at the least the lives of the men in their units could be jeopardized if inactive and volunteer reservists were now—almost overnight—pulled out of the service. This is not a matter to be decided through emotion, on the spur of the moment, without full and complete consideration. You can, as the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, just a few minutes ago pointed out, wreck essential combat units simply because there are not yet sufficient trained replacements. This is

true not only in the Navy, but in the Air Forces and in the ground forces as well. However much we sympathize with the plight of the inactive reservists and the volunteer reservists—and I have a very genuine interest in them—I would much prefer to be in position where I could conscientiously support this amendment—I fear it would be dangerous to summarily jerk them out of the services by this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAHON) there were—ayes 110, noes 94.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. MAHON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 122, noes 102.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 62, line 11, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, first I want to pay tribute for the work done by the chairman of this very able committee and all of the members of the committee. I do not believe anyone in the House, for a minute, is in any doubt of the fine work this committee put in in preparing this bill. The question that has been raised is, of course, what tools the committee has had in order to accomplish their job. I must say that a staff of two with possibly a few additional part-time helpers is hardly sufficient assistance to consider carefully a \$56,000,000 bill. I have noticed the 3,500 pages of these hearings, but I also notice that every witness who has appeared, and I went down the line pretty carefully, was from the Military Establishment. Those appearing before the committee, in other words, were presenting their point of view with no opposing witness.

In considering any appropriation bill, it seems to me there are two things that are essential. First is the consideration of whether we can afford it. This country is in debt. This country owes \$260,000,000,000. If we want to look for the cause of inflation, which every one of us agrees we have to fight, let us first look to that \$260,000,000,000. If we pass this \$56,000,000,000 bill today we are going to go into deficit financing some more, and we are going to increase the causes of inflation. The second thing in an appropriation bill that we want to look at is whether or not the various items are justified and are necessary. In my opinion, that has not been done on this particular bill. There is not a Member of the House, in my opinion, who does not deep down within him know that the appropriations for the military in the bill can be cut, and cut considerably. In St.

Louis we whipped a smoke condition. It was not done by any particular panacea, nor was it done by any waving of a wand. It was done by an inspection of each and every little chimney which was contributing to the smoke condition. In this particular bill I found one little chimney—one little chimney that I happen to know a little something about as a result of our work on the Bonner subcommittee with reference to Government surplus property. The item on page 62, section 625, calls for \$25,000,000 to assist the military in their salvage and scrap program, and the selling of equipment which they no longer can use. Right off the bat, I want to point out this particular item was not even studied by the subcommittee. There has been nothing done on it at all.

The best proof of that is that when you compile the three items that make up the \$25,000,000, you find that they add up to only \$17,000,000. So, in the first place, \$8,000,000 of the proposed \$15,000,000 saving is admitted. The military budgets only \$17,000,000, not \$25,000,000. An additional \$7,000,000 saving comes from this: We have been conducting a program trying to encourage the military to utilize more and more of their surplus property and have less for salvage and scrap. The three branches, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force have assured us they are going along with that program. Judging from the items, it is true that the Air Force is. In 1951 they had a budget of \$4,900,000. This year they have cut it to \$3,000,000. On the other hand, the Army has done nothing about it. They had \$10,000,000 last year and they are asking for \$10,000,000 this year. The Navy, on the other hand, is increasing its budget from \$1,792,000 to \$4,000,000, an increase of over \$2,000,000.

So, applying the formula that the Air Force has used to cut back its program, which they should do in the name of economy, we actually would be saving the difference between \$10,000,000 and \$6,000,000 for the Army. Cutting the Navy back from \$4,000,000 to the \$1,000,000, which would be a similar cut, based on what they had spent in 1951, and we have a total of \$7,000,000 of saving to add to the \$8,000,000 that the military admit they do not need.

That is the basis on which I have proposed cutting this figure from \$25,000,000 to \$10,000,000. It is a program that the armed services themselves say they will embark upon, and I suggest that the Congress implement that program by cutting this item.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can come to some agreement on limitation of debate on this amendment.

Mr. TABER. I wonder if the committee could not accept the amendment? It seems to be a pretty reasonable amendment.

Mr. SIKES. I am afraid the committee could not accept the amendment.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that debate on this amendment be

limited to 5 minutes, the last 2½ minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, the gentleman heard the statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. Is he right about his figure?

Mr. SIKES. That is not the information that the committee has.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean the gentleman is wrong in his addition?

Mr. SIKES. That is not the information given to us by the military officials. I will touch on that in a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at the conclusion of the vote on the Curtis amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

While the figures given to us by the gentleman from Missouri were convincing from the standpoint of the report he quoted, I must point out that we on the committee have additional information which I think justifies the appropriation requested.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In your report I will refer you to page 153. It shows, "Department of the Army, preparation for sale or salvage of military property, \$10,000,000."

Turning to page 156, you will find a similar item under "Navy, preparation for sale or salvage of military property, \$4,000,000."

That makes \$14,000,000.

Then, on page 157, under "Department of Air Force," you will find, "Preparation for sale or salvage of military property, \$3,000,000."

That makes a total of \$17,000,000 and not \$25,000,000.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. If the statement which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] has made is not correct, I regret very much that time has been fixed for debate, because this is a subject that has caused quite a lot of discussion throughout the length and breadth of the States. I cannot find myself where the committee can substantiate what they are asking for. I can only find that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is correct in what he points out.

Mr. SIKES. I have just discussed this matter with the staff members and clerks of the committee as well as with other members of the committee. I find no reason to accept the gentleman's

amendment. Frankly, there is a discrepancy between the amount of \$25,000,000 carried in the bill and in the \$17,000,000 justified in the report. That is unfortunate from the standpoint of a clear record. However, I want to point out the fact that there is a step-up in the tempo of the program of renovating and disposing of the salvage material that is left in the hands of the services; unless this money is provided it is not felt that it will be possible to utilize all the material that is available. Much of it cannot be sold without renovation, either because of its condition or because the law requires it to be modified, as in the case of old live ammunition which can no longer be used by the troops. By having these funds available for the operation of the salvage program it is felt it will be possible actually to show a profit to the Treasury which will more than justify the additional funds carried in this bill; in other words, to show monetary returns greater than otherwise could be made possible and to utilize scrap and salvage material which rapidly is rusting and rotting.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The steel industry is crying for more and more scrap. Mr. Engel, of Michigan, during the Eightieth Congress, was chairman of the subcommittee and was the man responsible for this provision being in the law, because he saw—and I opposed the proposal at the time—that by using this scrap and encouraging the services to get rid of obsolete equipment which could not be used that the industry of the country could be served and that the defense effort could be promoted. So it is really the proposal of Mr. Engel that we are talking about now, and it has proved to be of very great value. I wish we had time to read the hearings and learn what has been done in recent years in the salvaging of material. To fail to prosecute this program would in my opinion retard the defense effort and make it impossible for the services to get rid of a lot of old stuff that can better be used as scrap material by industry.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If you read the hearings of our committee you would come to the conclusion that better use could be made of this material by repairing it and using it for the purpose intended instead of salvaging it for scrap.

Mr. MAHON. We could use much more money on a salvage program. It would seem unwise to make this change in the bill.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. I would like to ask the gentleman when the armed services developed their new program for surplus materials, this committee that the gentleman from Missouri and myself are on has visited these various establishments. I see no change in the custom that they have been carrying out, and I would like to hear what the gentleman has to say about it.

Mr. MAHON. This stuff is brought in from Germany; it is brought in from the Pacific.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Oh, yes; it is being brought in from Germany and the Pacific and sold back to the Army in many cases by profiteers.

Mr. MAHON. It could not be under the provisions of this amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Time for debate on this amendment has been fixed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if I understand this amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, it all depends on whether or not certain items have been added correctly. Am I wrong about that?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Eight million dollars of it is that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What is that?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Eight of the fifteen millions saving is just a matter of addition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you mean that when they add these items mentioned in this paragraph of the bill instead of getting twenty-five they get eight million less?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. They get \$8,000,000 less.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If that is so, I do not understand why we do not accept the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. You can have a \$1,000,000 salvage program; you can have a \$10,000,000 salvage program. This proposes a \$25,000,000 salvage program. You might very advantageously up it to a \$50,000,000 salvage program in order to channel into industry all this scrap material which never will be used by the Army and industry is crying for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then why do you have any items at all? Why do you not say that you want \$25,000,000 for a salvage program rather than to put in these three items, if that is the committee's purpose.

Mr. MAHON. It is just a \$25,000,000 program for salvage, but there are many millions of dollars in excess of that where the salvage must take place at some future time or else it is going to be lost.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] said, I cannot understand why you put these three items in at all and then ask for more than they total.

Mr. MAHON. Please do not be misled; this is only a \$25,000,000 program. It could be a larger salvage program. Other portions of the program will be included in future years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is not the point. You are asking for three items which total \$17,000,000, but instead of asking for \$17,000,000 you ask for \$25,000,000. Then why do you ask for more than the total of your items?

Mr. MAHON. There will be many millions of dollars in succeeding years for a salvage program.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know that; that part is all right. That is not the point here.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. On page 153, as I understand it, if the gentleman from Texas will look at his own report, he will find an item of \$10,000,000 for this particular special account for the Army, on page 157 he will find an item for the Air Force of \$3,000,000 and up above for preparation of salvaged material for the Navy he will find an item of \$4,000,000, which makes a total of \$17,000,000, just as the gentleman from Missouri said. I cannot understand why we should not go by the report.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When the garage or grocery store sends me a bill and the items they ask me to pay do not total up to the total of the bill they present, I just send them a check for the items they bill me. I cannot see why the amendment is not good. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is to be commended for the very careful study of this bill—his industry has saved at least for the present \$8,000,000, no small amount even today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill granting appropriations to the Defense Department for the fiscal year ending next June 30 gives me great concern. This bill calls for an appropriation of \$56,000,000,000. It is hard for the average person to grasp the magnitude and significance of such a figure. It means, excluding Sundays and holidays, more than \$1 a day for every man, woman, and child in the United States. In this time of high costs, the enactment of this measure will be the single most inflationary force operating on our economy.

Almost all Americans, and practically every Member of Congress, is fully aware of the vital need for a strong Defense Establishment. The threat which Russian Communist imperialism brings to our way of life and to the destiny of freedom is too real and too near to be ignored. We have our difficulties in this country and in this Congress on how to cope with this threat. Yet we are all in agreement on two things: Commu-

nism directed by the Kremlin is the real enemy, and our own military strength is vital for our own survival.

All of us know that there is a substantial amount of waste in the various military services. This point cannot be ignored or questioned by any man or woman who has ever served in any military branch. I do not blame this waste entirely on our military leaders. They are fundamentally trained for war, and war by its very nature is wasteful. Regardless of the curriculum that a young man might pursue at West Point or Annapolis, he is trained primarily to lead troops into battle or to lead an air mission against the enemy, or to command a ship at sea in time of war. He is not trained to cut costs or to construct and live within a budget that is related to the gross national product or the total Federal income. One does not have to be a management engineer or an efficiency expert to find waste and duplication of effort in the Pentagon, or in any navy yard, army base, or air field. The fiscal control of the military rests with the Congress, and, therefore, the responsibility for the elimination of waste is, to a great extent, ours. Yet, in view of the huge Military Establishment which we of necessity must maintain at present, it is almost impossible for us, as Members of Congress, to adequately discharge this responsibility.

The subcommittee which has held lengthy hearings on this appropriation has worked diligently and tirelessly for more than 6 months. Yet it is impossible for these able men to do more than call upon the military to justify their requests for funds. The committee staff is limited and can do no more than dig into the figures as presented. I feel sure that a staff of experts responsible to the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives could uncover countless examples of waste and could justify its cost by more than 100 times over.

The Appropriations Committee, through its various subcommittees, has spent thousands of hours in attempting to cut the colossal budget requested by the President in January. We, in the House, have made certain additional cuts. Some of us feel proud of the economies effected, especially in view of the arrogant challenge of President Truman when he dared the Congress to cut his budget. Yet all the cuts that we have made and all that we will make will not add up to as much as 4 percent of the amount of this military budget alone.

Mr. Chairman, this House might well authorize the employment of 100 expert investigators, at a salary of \$12,500 each. This would make a total expense of \$1,250,000. These men would not stay in Washington but would travel constantly throughout the year, visiting the various military installations both at home and abroad. Let us assume a travel and subsistence expense of \$150 per week for each man. On a basis of 50 weeks, this would total three-fourths of a million dollars per year. The information collected by these experts would have to be assembled and presented to

the members of the subcommittee handling the military appropriation so that they could effectively exercise the economies indicated. Let us assume a cost for this clerical help and office expense of \$800,000 per year. This brings us to a total figure of \$2,800,000.

Two million eight hundred thousand dollars is one two-hundredth of 1 percent of the total military budget for the current fiscal year. Expressed in more understandable language, it is less than 1½ cents per year for every man, woman, and child in the country as opposed to more than \$1 per day for each man, woman, and child, which is the total cost for the defense budget.

I do not propose here another Federal bureau within the executive department. I merely propose a substantial expansion of the staff of the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the House Appropriations Committee. As I have already stated, these investigators must not sit behind a desk in Washington. I propose a continuing field study of all of our military establishments, wherever they might be located.

If these experts can show us how to save 1 percent in the operation of our military branch, they will have earned their expenses by more than 200 times. If the savings are as much as 5 percent, the investment will be returned to the taxpayer 1,000 times over. Now it is inconceivable to me that if these men are properly selected they cannot bring in suggestions which will result in savings of less than 2 percent. What does 2 percent mean in terms that you and I can understand? This little 2 percent is 13 times the amount of money which the Federal Government is now spending in aid to hospital construction. It is more than 3 times the cost estimate of the original Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill for low-cost public housing. It is more than 3 times the amount proposed to be spent under the various proposals for Federal aid to education. This little 2 percent is greater than the total annual expenditure for all flood protection throughout the entire United States.

In the discharge of my responsibility as a Member of this body, my only choice is to vote for the pending bill. Most of my colleagues will, in good conscience, do likewise. The times permit of no other action. Yet economic strength is as vital as military strength to the survival of this country. We face huge military expenditures for an indefinite number of years. Our economy will fall if we are complacent in granting these enormous appropriations. We cannot blindly vote "aye" because it is in the name of defense. We cannot be satisfied with lifting up a corner of the rug and sweeping out a little dust. Each and every spring, we must take the rug out of the house, hang it in the back yard and give it an old-fashioned beating. To do this, we must have an adequate staff responsible to the legislative branch of the Government and to it alone. We are constantly told that a strong defense is our only salvation. I respectfully submit that a strong economy is the basic support of a strong defense and is, therefore, even more vital to our salvation.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: On page 63, line 10, insert the following:

"Sec. 628. No appropriation contained in this act shall be available for any direct expense (including commercial transportation in the United States to the place of sale but excluding all transportation outside the United States) in connection with the maintenance, conduct, operation, or management of sales commissaries, or commissary stores, of agencies of the Department of Defense, except where reimbursement for such expenses is to be made to the appropriations concerned from the proceeds of sales therein."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, what is done here is simply to exclude on page 63 the objectionable language that was in this paragraph in the first place and to which a point of order was raised. As the amendment now reads, there is no objectionable language, and no point of order can be raised against it because it is purely a limitation on the expenditure of funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 65, after line 10, insert the following:

"Sec. 630. No part of any money appropriated in this act or included under any contract authority granted in this act shall be used in making payments under any construction contract or any contract for supplies, materials, equipment, or services, exceeding \$10,000 in amount, unless the person to whom such contract is awarded shall have furnished to the United States a performance bond with a surety or sureties satisfactory to the officer awarding such contract and in such amount as he may deem adequate, for the protection of the United States; except that the Secretary of Defense may waive the requirement of a performance bond in the case of any of the contracts referred to in this section if he determines that the waiver of such requirement is in the interest of the national security and defense."

On page 65, line 11, strike out "630" and insert in lieu thereof "631."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for reserving his point of order to this very important amendment. Actually I am constrained to concede that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. The basic need for such a provision in the law is so vital, however, it was my hope the point of order would be waived. Needless to say I can and do appreciate the position and the responsibility of the chairman of this subcommittee. I believe the gentleman from Texas agrees wholeheartedly with the purpose of this amendment but at the same time feels such legislation should be handled by the Committee on Armed Services. With that point of view I agree but the matter is so serious I have offered the amendment today in order that the

Members would see what is taking place under the present contracting methods used by the Department of Defense.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee of the Whole for the last several days has been considering a military-appropriation bill totaling over \$56,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year. When this bill is approved by the Congress the Department of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force will be in the next 12 months spending this gigantic sum all over the United States with many contractors. Previous experience shows that in many, many instances the Department of Defense has been extremely lax in the expenditure of the funds the Congress has appropriated. The best evidence of this laxity is found in a recent report submitted to the House by the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services under the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT]. At this time I would like to compliment the gentleman from Louisiana, his subcommittee, and his staff for the excellent manner in which this investigation was conducted. The subcommittee report on this case vividly points out basic weaknesses in the procurement methods of the Department of Defense. It is entitled "The Case of Consolidated Industries, Inc." The report shows without any question of a doubt that the Department of Defense should require performance bonds when all or most military or defense contracts are awarded.

For the information of the Members I would like to read this report, including the recommendations of the subcommittee:

The Procurement Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the House has held extensive hearings on the procurement procedures of the Armed Services. Several reports have been issued and more are to follow. The purpose of these reports (and of this report in particular) is to set out by specific example procedures which in our opinion require correction.

The instance cited here in detail does not involve a critical item. It was, however, a necessary item for classroom use. The handling of these bids will be set out in some detail to show by specific instance, where the subcommittee finds in many contracts that millions of dollars are being wasted in defaulted and delinquent contracts, to say nothing of frittering away of the time of Government employees, both uniformed and civilian, who are spending their time in doing the work which contractors are paid to perform. It is this leakage which increases the already heavy burden of the taxpayer, and which can be and ought to be stopped.

Every contract begins with a preaward survey. The Government finds out for itself the capacity and ability of the contractor to perform the work. Upon the accuracy of these reports depends the action of the contracting officer. Once a contract is let the Government is bound to the contractor. It will be demonstrated by the following report wherein the Government loses by incompetent preaward inspection.

CONSOLIDATED INDUSTRIES, INC., MEMPHIS, TENN.
(Contract DA-11-009-QM6508, Contract DA-11-009-QM-6512, Contract NOM-59929)

This company was formed about 1947. Its moving spirit was Jacob W. P. Fleming, who owned 80 percent of the stock. Fleming through another company had done some subcontracting in World War II. He had never been in a company which held a prime

contract. But he had been in a company (in fact in several companies) engaged in the veterans' training program; and at the times hereinafter recited these companies and Fleming were having difficulties with the Veterans' Administration, which this subcommittee will not go into.

In any event, Consolidated Industries had not turned out a thing for nearly 18 months preceding the award of these contracts. Before that it claims to have sold several hundred thousand dollars worth of furniture. Fleming went to Chicago in December 1950 where he says he found that the Quartermaster was inviting bids on metal folding chairs. Two invitations were posted with specifications for 118,000 metal folding chairs. We take up the story with this beginning. Some of the incidents relating to what followed have been detailed by Hon. GERALD R. FORD, of Michigan, both in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 22, 1951, page 5656 et seq., and additional details were presented by him to the subcommittee. Thereafter, the subcommittee took testimony and made a further investigation. Here is what happened:

Fleming stated under oath to the subcommittee that his company was organized in 1947. It occupied a building in Memphis, had sold some furniture in the early years, but for nearly 18 months prior to these awards it had done only a negligible amount of business. Fleming wanted to get into defense work. He got the invitations for bids on folding steel chairs at Chicago.

Here is what was on hand when he prepared the company's bids: The company had no steel on hand. It had no commitment from any supplier for steel either as to quantity, kind, or the time of delivery. It did not even have a commitment on price. Fleming testified that he just took some warehouse prices which he knew about and other prices which he had heard mentioned in Memphis and guessed at a price which he used in making up the bids. He did not have the necessary tools, dies, jigs or machinery; moreover, he told the subcommittee that the company did not have the money to buy them; but he knew he would have to get money somewhere to buy these things or would have to subcontract part of the work. He had no commitment from any prospective subcontractor in preparing his bid. The company had a couple thousand dollars on hand. He knew the company would require financing; and he figured on an RFC loan for that purpose.

He testified that the margin of profit was figured at from 10 percent to 15 percent, or something over \$45,000.

The company was the low bidder on both invitations by some \$55,000.

Then followed the preaward inspection. Quartermaster Supplement to the Joint Procurement Regulations, section VI, Bonds and Insurance, part I, paragraph 6-100.3 reads as follows:

"Except under unusual circumstances bid and performance bonds are not to be required in connection with supply contracts. Instead, maximum reliance will be placed on preaward surveys and ascertainment of finance responsibility of bidders in making the award of contracts."

We summarized the report of inspector No. 1: William K. Brown, area supervisor, made his inspection on January 10, 1951. He found the plant was "cluttered up with old broken-down refrigerators, desks, benches, and a lot of torn-up scrap lumber where they had started to dismantle the benches and so forth that they had used for the vocational training school." He found that there was "no activity in the plant whatsoever . . . that this plant had not been in operation for the past 18 months. . . ." In his report he states that he found the contractor "did not have

the necessary equipment to perform the contract; that he lacked painting equipment, drying oven, spot welders, cleaning tanks, dies, jigs, fixtures, and heavy presses necessary to fabricate metal for folding chairs."

He did not report on the financial condition of the company. He did an excellent job and faithfully reported exactly what there was to report as confirmed by the admissions of Fleming, the president of the concern, heretofore recited.

Mr. Brown, inspector No. 1, advised that the contractor was not able to perform the contract for the reasons given in his report and advised against award.

We continue with activities of Consolidated Industries, Inc., after the bids were opened:

After the bids were opened, Fleming was ready for the role of the small-business man. His company was low bidder and stood to make upward of \$45,000. If everything went well and he could get these contracts, then he could go out and start looking for materials, machinery and the financing; and then Consolidated would be in business and Fleming would be a small-business man. His testimony was that at the letting in Chicago he learned that some of his competitors questioned his ability to perform the contracts, so he informed the subcommittee that "being a small-business man and unaccustomed to such threats or pressure" he betook himself to Washington. There he visited the offices of several Senators and Congressmen and spent most of his time with their aides. Apparently, the mantle of the small-business man showed gracefully on him for these aides rose to his cause. Somehow the news of his Washington visit was discreetly imparted to the Chicago quartermaster office. There a succession of three other inspectors, were dispatched to Memphis at regular intervals. Each dutifully reported that Consolidated could perform these contracts if an award were made to it. As these inspectors warmed to their tasks we summarize their reports:

Inspector No. 2: On January 24, 1951, a new survey was ordered by the Chicago Procurement Office "to give this contractor an opportunity to prove that our initial survey was wrong and to prove that he could perform." Time was of the essence. The chairs were urgently needed. Inspector No. 2 who was on an assignment at Clarksville, Tenn., was directed by phone to proceed immediately to Memphis, Tenn., to Consolidated Industries, Inc. He knew only the identification number of the contract and the quantity of chairs called for.

By this time Fleming and his associates knew that another inspection was to be made in the Consolidated Industries, Inc., so the stage was set for the visit from Government men. Inspector No. 2 reported that the plant was clean and that in fact some men were there at the time welding and making chair frames. It developed from subsequent testimony by Mr. Fleming that the men were actually engaged in applying the plastic back and seats to certain steel-frame chairs that he had purchased.

While sitting there talking, inspector No. 2 reports two calls came in to Fleming. The man on the other end of the line talked in such a loud voice it was possible for the inspector to overhear: "We have a carload of steel ready for delivery now." Thus, inspector No. 2 had the answer to his questions on the steel necessary to manufacture the chairs.

He determined the capacity of the plant on the capacity of the bending machines. Each machine could make about 400 bends per hour. He multiplied that number by 16 hours per day (two shifts) and came to the conclusion that the plant could manufacture 100,000 chairs per month. This in-

spector was told that the seats and backs were going to be subcontracted.

He reported, "The facility is engaged in production of metal furniture and their normal capacity on an 8-hour shift is approximately 100,000 folding chairs per month; however, at the moment due to lack of steel this production had to be curtailed." That was wholly false—the plant had not been in operation for 18 months and had never in its existence made a folding chair. This inspector's downfall came when he accepted the misleading statements made by Fleming and his associates.

Inspector No. 3: Inspector No. 3 visited the plant on January 31, just 7 days after inspector No. 2. He found no evidence that this plant had recently manufactured any furniture. He did see some men experimenting with dinette furniture including table and chairs with tubular legs. He noticed that the plant had recently been thoroughly cleaned out and that certain machine tools had been rearranged. He also saw some experimental work being done on refrigeration units. Fleming who conducted the inspection on a tour of the plant conveyed the impression that he was going to manufacture or assemble these units in his plant. Fleming pointed out some radio technicians to the inspector who were doing development work on a travel type of film that could be used in television. The inspector was impressed with these men as being high-type personnel.

Fleming testified that these men were not working for Consolidated Industries, but that he permitted them to use his shop for the experimental work that they were conducting. They served as window dressing for the benefit of the inspector.

Inspector No. 3 was very thorough in taking an inventory of the equipment located in the plant; however, very little of the equipment could be used for the manufacture of the steel folding chairs. The majority of it was left over from the training school activities for the Veterans' Administration. This inspector did not check with the VA because he did not feel that it was in his jurisdiction. Neither did he look into the financial ability of the contractor because he did not receive directions to do so.

This inspector like the one that preceded him determined the capacity of the plant by the capacity of the bending machines. He reported that this facility could produce 75,000 chairs per month, beginning the first month, 60 days after the contract was awarded.

However, the contract required that 75,000 chairs be delivered 60 days after the contract was awarded with the balance of 43,000 chairs due 90 days after the date of the contract. An evaluation of this inspector's report alone shows that the contract could not possibly have been fulfilled, within the time limits called for.

Inspector No. 4: Inspector No. 4 was called upon by the Quartermaster to give his opinion of the three (3) earlier preaward surveys of inspectors Nos. 1, 2, and 3. He visited the plant on February 5 and 6. Inspector No. 4 succumbed to the resourceful imagination and optimism of Fleming. He testified that he was not required to look into the financial background of the company because he was appearing in the role of a consultant and was not directed to look into the "details" that the other inspectors should have covered. He did not check into the contracts with the Veterans' Administration, because he was not directed to go into that. His tour conductor was Fleming.

Inspector No. 4 reported, "The company has previously and is at the present time producing dinette sets consisting of dinette

tables with tubular metal legs and chairs fabricated from steel tubing."

Fleming's testimony is contrary to that.

He has testified that his company was manufacturing dinette sets with the tubular metal legs. He had, however, bought the chairs and tables and was assembling them. He testified that Consolidated was making the seats and backs of leatherette, plywood and cotton linters. He had nothing to do with the steel fabrication or the bending of the tubular legs for the furniture.

This inspector was also duped.

His report states that this company, "required a minimum of 60 days lead time on deliveries * * * to enable them to rearrange some of the equipment in their plant and set up an assembly line, spray booth, baking oven and packaging and packing facilities before they could get into actual production of producing end items."

As previously reported, the contract required delivery of 75,000 chairs in 60 days and the balance in 90 days.

Similar to the report filed by inspector No. 3, a proper evaluation of this report would have shown that the contractor could not possibly have complied with the delivery dates set forth in the invitation to bid, to say nothing of other glaring oversights and naïveté, while evaluating the work of his predecessors.

After these latter three reports had been received, the matter was up to the quartermaster at Chicago.

The commanding general of the Quartermaster Depot at Chicago appeared before the subcommittee. He occupies the unique position of being in charge of the depot, but without authority to bind the Government on contracts. He stated that he participated in the decision to make this award. Undoubtedly, he did it in the conscientious performance of his duty; and the subcommittee is impressed with his circumspect conduct and meticulous handling of the matter. But the general had to rely on inspection reports. There was nothing to help him from those sources. He had before him two low bids. He wanted to save money for the Government. He wanted to be entirely proper and correct in dealing with Consolidated. So he cast his vote for Consolidated on the evidence before him.

A contracting officer awarded the contract to Consolidated Industries, Inc. for 118,000 chairs to be delivered—75,000 on April 7 and 43,000 on May 3, 1951.

Consolidated's travail had begun. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation withdrew its hoped-for commitment. The search for steel was frantically on with the Government taking that job over for the most part as will be detailed later. There was no machinery and no money to buy it. An RFC audit of the company showed that on December 30, 1950, just before the awards, the company had on hand \$410,411.

April and May came and no chairs were produced. The contracts were hopelessly in default. As the situation grew more gloomy, Fleming got in touch with a salesman he met in Chicago at the bid opening. The salesman represented International Rolling Mills. He wanted to sell some steel, Fleming told the subcommittee. Out of that arrangement, these contracts of the small-business man were assigned to Rabar Finance Co., a subsidiary of International Rolling Mills; and the finance company is the 100-percent owner of the contracts. Fleming ruefully stated to the subcommittee that he didn't think his company would have any profit left.

The chairs are now being produced, months in default of the due date. On July 25, 1951, only 7,000 chairs had been delivered and 12,000 chairs were awaiting inspection.

There are nearly 100,000 yet to be delivered. The Army has been standing a long time.

This is the saga of an attempt to balloon a cash balance of \$410 into a profit of more than \$45,000, with Government contracts used as a hunting license for plant, machinery, materials and financing. A competent inspection service would have discovered it.

MARINE CORPS AND NAVAL INSPECTOR

In April 1951 while Consolidated's contracts with the Army were in default, the Marine Corps advertised for 12,000 chairs. Consolidated submitted the low bid.

A naval inspector was sent on April 17, 1951, to report on the qualification of the contractor. His report was this:

He contacted the vice president, asked to be shown the property and these various machines. He saw that there was little operation going on at the time, which he didn't question, because "it wasn't included in my survey."

He said his mission was to make a survey "to determine if the bidder is capable of performing in the event of an award for the 12,000 chairs." He says he wasn't asked to make a statement that the chairs could be produced in 30 days, although that was required by the invitation to bid. It was his understanding "from the company officials that their production was from 1,800 to 2,000 chairs per day." They indicated to him that they had made chairs before, he says, but he had no way of knowing whether they had or not.

The company, he said, did not volunteer the information that they had Army contracts. He says he didn't ask them about that because "he hadn't been instructed to ask that question." He said that the company didn't volunteer any information that was not asked for. The only information he could get from them on their financing he says was that they were 100 percent financed by Rabar Finance Co.

He made no investigation of the company's experience because "he was not instructed to do so." He says, simply enough, that he was to "look into the manufacturing ability of the company as to whether they could produce the chairs they were bidding on."

So the Naval Inspector reported favorably. The Marine Corps awarded it a contract for 12,000 chairs to be delivered in 30 days. And that contract has not been performed as yet.

QUARTERMASTER CORPS—EXPEDITER SERVICE

What this type of procurement cost the Government over and above the delay in receiving its products, in performing services with Government employees which the contractor should have performed was this:

A lieutenant colonel and staff were put to work searching for steel to commence the contract. He and his staff scoured the country by personal search and telephone, requesting, pleading, and probably becoming more emphatic than that, in helping perform this critical "defense order."

Of course, the requests of the Government are honored in times of emergency. Whenever the Government "expeditors" thought they had located some steel they called Fleming and he placed orders. The Government found a load of steel coming from Belgium and advised Fleming to place an order for it. The ship arrived a month after it was promised. It was misrouted. The Government "expeditors" went to work by telephone and other means tracing it. They finally located it.

Later Consolidated was in trouble over the chair tips to be used. It couldn't obtain them. Government expeditors went to work. NPA regulations prohibited the use of natural rubber. The Government expeditors searched the industry for a supplier. Finally, that search was abandoned and their ener-

gies were expended in locating, testing, and developing a plastic cap, which was finally used.

It would be impossible to determine by a cost survey the time, salaries, and personal expenses of these Government employees who were actually performing work which the contractor had been engaged to perform.

The supposed saving of \$55,000 evaporated very quickly over these months of delay and trouble—all because of incompetent, inadequate preaward inspection.

In the many cases which the subcommittee has examined of incompetent preaward inspection the stock excuses have been either:

1. The regulations did not require the inspector to make the inquiry which would have ascertained the facts bearing upon the contractors' qualifications; or
2. That question wasn't on the form; or
3. I wasn't instructed to ask that.

It is high time that someone in authority took a look at the regulations and abolished them as a sanctuary for failures; and it is also time that some departmental procedures be worked out to educate inspectors, on the questions that ought to be asked in a preaward inspection.

If, in the absence of a performance bond, maximum reliance is placed on preaward inspection, then that inspection should be adequate.

Price is not the only criteria for a contracting officer. Performance is equally important in determining a sound economical, businesslike contract. The overbalance of one or the other produces losses of the type such as these shown in this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The subcommittee recommends that the services take immediate steps to improve and correct procurement regulations to assure competent preaward inspections; and that immediate steps be taken to educate inspectors upon the need of a full and adequate inquiry when making their examinations. Forms and regulations which leave them hide-bound, if in fact that is the case, should be scrapped in favor of a realistic and competent approach.

2. The subcommittee will continue its study and investigation into the need for performance bonds, if necessary recommending legislation, should our further inquiries prove the desirability of them. But unless the preaward inspections can be improved that step may become necessary.

F. EDWARD HÉBERT, Subcommittee Chairman; O. C. FISHER; EDWARD DEGRAFFENRIED; L. GARY CLEMENTE; WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.; CLYDE DOYLE; CHARLES H. ELSTON; JACK Z. ANDERSON; HARRY L. TOWE; WILLIAM E. HESS; W. STERLING COLE.

Approved:

CARL VINSON, *Chairman*.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan upon his industry with respect to the problem which he has discussed. I think it is a very serious problem and I think some kind of legislation which will meet the problem adequately should be enacted by Congress. But I do feel that his amendment is subject to a point of order; that it should be further screened and studied by the appropriate committee. I think the gentleman is taking a step in the right direction in calling this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman. I am confident from my investigation of this case, and I called this case to the attention of the Committee on Armed Services in May of this year, that the Department of Defense could literally save many millions of dollars if the Department would only put the responsibility for the performance of most military contracts directly on the contractors and their bonding companies. I sincerely hope that the legislative committee—the Committee on Armed Forces—will come forth promptly with the necessary legislation to correct the current situation which is presently wasting the valuable and priceless time and money of the Federal Government.

In closing, I wish to assure my colleagues that I intend to introduce a bill similar to my amendment. The Committee on Armed Services, based on its investigation of the Consolidated, Inc., case, and others should take immediate action to end the deplorable procurement policies of the Department of Defense.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman withdraw his amendment?

Mr. FORD. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. PRIEST] having assumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5054) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 348, nays 2, answered present 1, not voting 81, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—348

Aandahl	D'Ewart	Kelley, Pa.
Abbitt	Dolliver	Kelly, N. Y.
Adair	Dondero	Keogh
Addonizio	Donohue	Kerr
Albert	Donovan	Kersten, Wis.
Allen, Calif.	Doughton	Kilburn
Andersen,	Doyle	Kilday
H. Carl	Elliot	King
Anderson, Calif.	Evins	Kirwan
Andresen,	Felghan	Klein
August H.	Fellows	Kluczynski
Andrews	Fenton	Lane
Anfuso	Fernandez	Lanham
Angell	Fisher	Lantaff
Armstrong	Flood	Larcade
Aspinall	Forand	Latham
Auchincloss	Ford	LeCompte
Ayres	Forrester	Lesinski
Bailey	Frazier	Lind
Baker	Fugate	Lovre
Bakewell	Fulton	Lyle
Barrett	Furcolo	McCarthy
Bates, Mass.	Gamble	McConnell
Battle	Garmatz	McCormack
Beamer	Gary	McCulloch
Beckworth	Gathings	McGregor
Belcher	Gavin	McGuire
Bender	George	McKinnon
Bennett, Fla.	Golden	McMullen
Bennett, Mich.	Goodwin	McVey
Bentsen	Graham	Mack, Wash.
Bishop	Granahan	Madden
Blackney	Granger	Magee
Blatnik	Green	Mahon
Boggs, Del.	Greenwood	Mansfield
Bolling	Gregory	Martin, Iowa
Boiton	Gross	Martin, Mass.
Bonner	Gwinn	Mason
Bow	Hagen	Meador
Boykin	Hale	Morrow
Bramblett	Hall,	Miller, Md.
Bray	Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.
Brooks	Hall,	Miller, N. Y.
Brown, Ga.	Leonard W.	Mills
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Morano
Brownson	Hand	Morrison
Bryson	Harden	Morton
Buchanan	Hardy	Multer
Budge	Harris	Mumma
Burdick	Harrison, Va.	Murdock
Burleson	Harrison, Wyo.	Murphy
Burnside	Harvey	Murray, Tenn.
Burton	Havenner	Nelson
Bush	Hays, Ark.	Nicholson
Butler	Hays, Ohio	Norblad
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Norrell
Byrnes, Wis.	Heller	O'Brien, Ill.
Camp	Herlong	O'Brien, Mich.
Canfield	Herter	O'Hara
Cannon	Heseltun	O'Neill
Carlyle	Hill	Ostertag
Carnahan	Hoeven	O'Toole
Case	Hoffman, Ill.	Patman
Celler	Hoffman, Mich.	Patterson
Chenoweth	Hollifield	Perkins
Chipperfield	Holmes	Phillips
Chudoff	Hope	Pickett
Church	Horan	Poage
Clemente	Howell	Polk
Clevenger	Hull	Potter
Cole, Kans.	Hunter	Powell
Cole, N. Y.	Irving	Preston
Combs	Jackson, Calif.	Price
Cooley	Jackson, Wash.	Priest
Cooper	James	Prouty
Corbett	Jarman	Rabaut
Cotton	Javits	Radwan
Coudert	Jenison	Rains
Cox	Jenkins	Ramsay
Crawford	Jensen	Reams
Crosser	Jonas	Redden
Crumpacker	Jones, Ala.	Reece, Tenn.
Cunningham	Jones, Mo.	Reed, Ill.
Curtis, Mo.	Jones,	Reed, N. Y.
Curtis, Nebr.	Hamilton C.	Rees, Kans.
Davis, Ga.	Jones,	Regan
Davis, Tenn.	Woodrow W.	Rhodes
Davis, Wis.	Judd	Ribicoff
Dawson	Karsten, Mo.	Richards
Deane	Kearney	Riehlman
DeGraffenried	Kearney	Riley
Denny	Kearns	Rivers
Denton	Keating	Roberts
Devereux	Kee	Robeson

Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sadlak
St. George
Sasser
Schwabe
Scott, Hardie
Scrivner
Secrest
Seely-Brown
Shafer
Sheehan
Sheppard
Sleminski
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Simpson, Pa.
Sittler
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.

Smith, Wis.
Spence
Springer
Stanley
Steed
Stefan
Stigler
Stockman
Sutton
Taber
Tackett
Talle
Teague
Thomas
Thompson,
Mich.
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tollefson
Towe
Trimble
Vail
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vaughn

Velde
Vinson
Vorys
Vursell
Walter
Watts
Welch
Wharton
Wickersham
Widnall
Wier
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Winstead
Withrow
Wolverton
Wood, Idaho
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—2

Buffett Marshall

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Phillips

NOT VOTING—81

Abernethy	Ellsworth	Murray, Wis.
Allen, Ill.	Elston	O'Konski
Allen, La.	Engle	Passman
Arends	Fallon	Patten
Barden	Fine	Poulson
Baring	Fogarty	Quinn
Bates, Ky.	Gordon	Rankin
Beall	Gore	Sabath
Berry	Grant	Saylor
Betts	Hart	Scott,
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Hugh D., Jr.
Bosone	Hedrick	Scudder
Breen	Hess	Shelley
Brehm	Hillings	Short
Buckley	Hinshaw	Smith, Kans.
Busbey	Johnson	Staggers
Chatham	Kennedy	Taylor
Chelf	Lucas	Welch
Colmer	McDonough	Werdel
Dague	McGrath	Wheeler
Delaney	McMillan	Whitaker
Dempsey	Machrowicz	Whitten
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Wolcott
Dollinger	Miller, Calif.	Wood, Ga.
Dorn	Mitchell	Woodruff
Durham	Morgan	Yorty
Eaton	Morris	
Eberharter	Moulder	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Short.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Patten with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Rankin with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Dague.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Scudder.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Lucas with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Busbey.
Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Engle with Mr. Foulson.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Quinn with Mr. Berry.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Johnson.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Chelf with Mr. Brehm.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication which was read:

AUGUST 9, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation from the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, effective immediately.

Respectfully,

HAROLD D. DONOHUE.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication which was read:

AUGUST 9, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the House Committee on Public Works, effective immediately, because of my impending election to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

TOM PICKETT.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

AUGUST 9, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, effective immediately.

Very sincerely yours,

WAYNE L. HAYS.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 376) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia, and VERA BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Veterans' Affairs.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 377) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, that WAYNE L. HAYS, of Ohio, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Banking and Currency.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I offer another resolution (H. Res. 378) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That TOM PICKETT, of Texas, and HAROLD D. DUNOHUE, of Massachusetts, be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on the Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the defense bill today may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks, and that all other Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks, and that in connection with my remarks made in committee I may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3282) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 13 to the above-entitled bill.

THE OATIS RESOLUTION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of the Oatis resolution be postponed, and that it may be in order at any time in the future for the House, as in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, to bring up the resolution for further consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understood it would be called up next Tuesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wanted to get the blanket authority first, and then confine it to a date.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What about Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I desire to announce now that it is the intention to

bring up the further consideration of the resolution on Tuesday next.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman could tell us whether or not it would be in order to make the Oatis resolution and the pending amendment the first order of business on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish the gentleman would not ask me to commit myself now. I will say this, that it is my intention, without committing myself that it be the first order of business, to bring it up on Tuesday, but I prefer not to be bound in case something else might develop.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, how will that affect the parliamentary situation with respect to the Oatis resolution?

Mr. McCORMACK. My unanimous-consent request was for a continuation of the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. GROSS. To be considered in the House?

Mr. McCORMACK. To be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, how will this affect William Oatis?

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as the gentleman from Massachusetts is concerned, he did everything he could for Mr. Oatis. The first day it was reported out I made arrangements to bring it up, if you want to go into that.

Mr. BENDER. Yes, I would like to get into that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not ask for a rule from the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] as well as members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, conferred, and we made arrangements to bring it up the very day it was reported, which is most unusual. Now I will say to my friend from Ohio, so far as the leadership on both sides is concerned, we have done everything we could to bring it up promptly. The bill came up in the House as in Committee of the Whole. If I had been in the House at the time I would not have permitted it. My understanding was that it was going to be called up by unanimous consent, but I happened to be in conference, and when I came back I found the House was sitting in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Then the amendment was offered, and we know the situation that developed, and in good faith, and then a unanimous request was made to put it over until today. Now we find that the consideration of the defense appropriation bill has run rather late in the afternoon, and now we have this situation. I then made the unanimous-consent request not for a certain date, but to bring it up at any time. But then I had an agreement for next Tuesday and I am putting it down for next Tuesday. Nobody can make any complaint about that.

Mr. BENDER. Does not the gentleman feel that we could possibly bring it up tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, now, again that is a matter that the leadership has gone into. The gentleman from Massachusetts is accommodating other interested Members on the gentleman's side, and I am glad to do it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I would like to ask a question. My understanding is that the first order of business on the Oatis resolution would be a vote on the so-called Armstrong amendment, which was exactly like part of a bill that I introduced for the protection and the release of Mr. Oatis. What is the parliamentary situation?

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding of the parliamentary situation is that the Armstrong amendment will come before the House as in Committee of the Whole as if no action had ever been taken on it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It will be voted up or down?

Mr. McCORMACK. Except that debate on it is closed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then the vote would come on the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. SHAFER. I object, Mr. Speaker. Let us get down to business on this thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMITTING CERTAIN FORMER CITIZENS TO REGAIN CITIZENSHIP

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad, indeed, to give my vigorous and enthusiastic support to H. R. 400.

This measure provides urgently needed relief for some 2,800 former citizens of the United States of Italian descent who are presently deemed to have lost their citizenship by reason of the fact that they voted in the Italian elections to regain their citizenship by taking a new oath of allegiance.

I personally know of several splendid, upstanding, patriotic gentlemen of Italian extraction who were caught in the mesh of official action denying their American citizenship only because in a spirit of understandable zeal for the welfare of their former motherland, they

voted in an Italian election which determined whether Italy should remain democratic or become communistic.

These men showed no lack of loyalty to or love for the United States. To the contrary, in common with all American citizens of Italian blood they invariably rendered unquestioned fealty to our Nation and unbounded affection and devotion to its institutions.

They merely moved in time of crisis to uphold the strength and will of the Italian people to maintain their freedom. That action must have our commendation and gratitude.

The Italian people are a noble and inspiring people. Rich in all the fine values of our civilization, cultured in the ways of a glorious, ancient past, loyal in their impulses to the best traditions of America, serving her needs in war and peace, with an undaunted and unswerving devotion, our brothers of Italian heritage are among the finest flower of our citizenship. I cannot sufficiently here laud their achievements and contributions. They are bright spots in American history—abundant proof of the invincibility and unity of the American Nation and the American people.

This measure will enable these unfortunate but well-meaning persons to recover what they cherish almost as much, if not more, than life itself. I have no doubt that the Congress and later our great President, recognizing the worth, integrity, and loyalty of our Italian brothers, recognizing the legitimacy of their claims, will place their seal of approval upon this meritorious measure.

I will vote for this bill.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT HOUSE AND SENATE BUDGET COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill in the House today providing for the setting up of a Joint House and Senate Budget Committee to keep surveillance of the expenditure of this vast sum of \$56,000,000,000 for national defense.

I believe that such a watchdog committee with its staff of experts can save from three to five billions of dollars of this sum we have appropriated today.

The administration would like not to be accountable to Congress for the expenditure of this vast sum. Experience of the last war shows a tendency on the part of the military to lapse into gigantic wastefulness that actually retards the defense effort. This watchdog committee would act as a traffic cop: Those who have the power to spend would know they are being watched and checked as they are spending the taxpayers' money. The amount saved by this watchdog committee would reduce the amount which must be extracted from every American taxpayer to pay for

our national defense, and thus reduce the amount deducted from every worker's pay check.

AUTOMOBILES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the House, in its kind understanding a short time ago, passed a bill, H. R. 4233, which would provide automobiles for amputees, those without hands and arms, as well as the blind and the paraplegics. Today the other body, instead of considering our bill, reported a bill which would provide automobiles only for the leg amputees. When this bill comes from the other body, I hope the House will amend it to provide for the blind and those without arms and hands and the paraplegics, and insist that the other body accept such amendment. We have just passed a bill for \$56,000,000,000 for the purchases of munitions and implements of war. I remind the House that probably some of our munitions have been responsible for these men losing their arms and legs and becoming blinded. We just passed that huge bill, and I am sure that the small amount of money that we want to give to these disabled men will be insisted upon when the bill comes up for action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the House, in its kind understanding a short time ago, passed a bill, H. R. 4233, which would provide automobiles for amputees, those without hands and arms, as well as the blind and the paraplegics. Today the other body, instead of considering our bill, reported a bill which would provide automobiles only for the leg amputees. When this bill comes from the other body, I hope the House will amend it to provide for the blind and those without arms and hands and the paraplegics, and insist that the other body accept such amendment. We have just passed a bill for \$56,000,000,000 for the purchases of munitions and implements of war. I remind the House that probably some of our munitions have been responsible for these men losing their arms and legs and becoming blinded. We just passed that huge bill, and I am sure that the small amount of money that we want to give to these disabled men will be insisted upon when the bill comes up for action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

TRANSFER OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION OFFICES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, a number of protests have been made on the floor of the House about the prospective removal of the Veterans' Administration offices for death benefits and insurance claims from New York and other cities to the city of Philadelphia. I wish to associate myself with these protests. No real economy will be made as a result thereof, an enormous dislocation will be caused to many able and faithful employees of the VA in New York and to their families, aggravation and trouble will be caused to many veterans, their survivors and dependents.

I have protested to the President and the Veterans' Administration against this projected move and trust that wiser counsels will prevail and that it will be—as it should be—canceled.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I commend the gentleman for the interest he has expressed in regard to this vital matter. I thoroughly

agree with everything the gentleman has said.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PROGRESS UNDER THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in 1947 economic and social conditions in Western Europe were deplorable. The war had left the Continent, particularly Italy and Western Germany, in an exhausted condition. Cities were partially destroyed, railroads ruined, factories demolished. The populace was impoverished, food was scarce, medical attention wanting, and fuel supplies low. Whether one walked in the streets of the cities or traveled through the countryside, the eye met ruin and destruction everywhere.

Having had an opportunity to visit Western Europe and be witness to her pitiful plight 4 years ago, I made it a point to return there this summer in order that I might learn first-hand what had been accomplished through the so-called Marshall plan.

The progress that has been made under this program in the short time that it has been in operation is nothing short of astonishing. The over-all improvement in economic conditions is apparent from every angle: the people are better fed, better clothed, better housed; stores are stocked with goods, ruined buildings have been repaired or are being rebuilt; factories have returned to operation. We can take rightful pride in what has been accomplished, but at the same time it is our responsibility to alter our program wherever necessary in order that we can expedite the realization of our ultimate aim—the destruction, or at least the complete isolation, of communism.

The Marshall plan had two objectives—one to stop the spread of communism—the other to build up the economy of Western Europe, to help it help itself and thus relieve our taxpayers.

The aim of the Marshall plan to stop the spread of the Red scourge in Europe and to build up the economies of the free countries against its infiltration has been accomplished. Yet there are certain deficiencies in our foreign-aid program that should be corrected at this time, when congressional committees are considering extension of this program. I think that when Congress originally wrote the authorization for the Marshall plan some stipulations should have been made for the receipt of this assistance. And I believe that now is the time for us to spell out what we expect of these nations before granting them further funds.

As I have pointed out, the general economic improvement resulting from our assistance is truly remarkable. But the workingman feels that he has not received any direct benefits from the Marshall plan, and, in my opinion, the failure to make greater inroads against communism in recent elections in France

and Italy is due largely to the capital that the Communists have been able to make over this situation. They are constantly propagandizing the people with the question, "What have you gotten from American aid?" And the workingman and his family, while realizing that he has at least risen from the destitution and misery that prevailed immediately after the war, is still confronted with a great spread between the cost of living and wages that has resulted from intense inflation against wage levels which have not advanced.

What is Congress to do? Perhaps we shall have to insist upon a complete readjustment of the tax machinery in these countries. Perhaps we must stipulate conditions that will permit us to participate more freely in the funneling of economic aid to the large masses who heretofore have received fewest benefits. The charge is repeatedly made that in these countries most of the benefits of the Marshall plan are being enjoyed by the wealthy—merchants, manufacturers, and financiers. There is no doubt that enormous fortunes are being accumulated. I believe that this situation might be corrected—and continued improvement made possible at less expense to the American taxpayer—if tax laws were tightened and tax-collection systems given a general overhauling. Too many people are permitted to escape their just taxes, and in this country we would consider some of those practices as flagrant violations of human rights.

There must also be some adjustment in the whole industrial philosophy, for at the present time most European manufacturers persist in controlling production, a condition that encourages the inflationary spiral and deprives the poorer classes of the products to which they are entitled. Numerous teams of industrialists, technicians, and labor representatives have been brought to this country under ECA auspices to study America's phenomenal mass-production methods, yet our systems are slow to be accepted abroad—to the detriment of the recovery program.

Finally, we must, if necessary, set forth in legislation the conditions through which our message will reach labor organizations and their membership. The labor attachés in our embassies are intelligent, capable men, but they are unable to contact the vast number of working people in France and Italy, for instance, because the most unions are Communist-led. In Germany the labor unions are better disciplined and are in a better position to deal with the employer, but in France and Italy the working man is largely at the mercy of the Red leadership. I feel that the committees now considering further foreign aid might profit by inviting the opinions of prominent labor men in this country in order that methods for remedying the situation may be incorporated into the new legislation.

I am happy to report that the Truman doctrine in Greece and Turkey has been a great success, and we can take pride as a Nation in the fact that the money we have spent in those countries has produced such excellent results.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MANSFIELD and to include two newspaper articles.

Mr. DONOVAN and to include extraneous matter, including a letter from a newspaper editor.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include an editorial.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. WICKERSHAM).

Mr. WILLIS and to include an editorial.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. WILLIS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORTON (at the request of Mr. WILLIS) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CLEMENTE (at the request of Mr. BYRNE of New York) and to include an article appearing in the New York Times of August 9, 1951, by Arthur Krock.

Mr. ELLIOTT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin and to include an article.

Mr. TABER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include quotations from hearings on the Department of Defense appropriation bill.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include a radio address.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts and to include an editorial from the New York American.

Mr. BEAMER (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include an editorial.

Mr. FARRINGTON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include a letter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. CRAWFORD to revise and extend his remarks of this afternoon and include certain supporting quotations.

Mr. SIKES.

Mr. JONAS and to include an editorial.

Mr. SHAFER and to include extraneous matter in 13 instances.

Mr. FORD to revise and extend remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and include a report of the procurement subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MEADER to revise and extend remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BOW to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHEEHAN in two instances to include an article.

Mr. AYRES and to include a letter.

Mr. BENDER in five instances.

Mr. McCORMACK to include an editorial from a recent issue of the Pilot.

Mr. JAVITS in two instances.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WERDEL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) on account of official business.

Mr. LIND, for Friday, August 10, 1951, on account of attendance at funeral of Representative Gillette.

Mr. DOLLINGER (at the request of Mr. CLEMENTE), for Thursday, August 9, 1951, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 400. An act to provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy; and

H. R. 3795. An act to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, August 10, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

701. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior certain lands on which the Seattle Fish and Wildlife Service Laboratory is located"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

702. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of this Department on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from April 1, 1951, through June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 13 of the act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

703. A letter from the General Services Administrator and the Postmaster General, transmitting the report covering Federal building projects eligible for construction throughout the United States, its Territories and possessions, pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1949 (Public Law 105, 81st Cong. (H. Doc. No. 224)); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

704. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting recommendations for a contribution of \$12,000,000 by the United States to the International Children's Emergency Fund (H. Doc. No. 225); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

705. A letter from the President, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, transmitting a letter relative to three recent loans made by the International

Bank, namely, two to the Republic of Nicaragua in the amount of \$4,700,000, and one to Iceland equivalent to \$2,450,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

706. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the merger of two or more national banking associations and for the merger of State banks with national banking associations, and for other purposes;" to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENTON: Committee on Appropriations. H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year 1952; without amendment (Rept. No. 811). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 1732. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii and Alaska; with amendment (Rept. No. 825). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 61. An act for the relief of Sister Carmen Teva Ramos; without amendment (Rept. No. 812). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 289. An act for the relief of Arno Edwin Kolm; without amendment (Rept. No. 813). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 518. An act for the relief of Dr. Isaac C. Goldstein; without amendment (Rept. No. 814). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 530. An act for the relief of Gerhard H. A. Anton Bebr; without amendment (Rept. No. 815). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 930. An act for the relief of Ivan Herben, his wife, son, and daughter-in-law; without amendment (Rept. No. 816). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1242. An act for the relief of Salomon Henri Laifer; without amendment (Rept. No. 817). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1503. An act for the relief of Harold Frederick D. Wolgramm; without amendment (Rept. No. 818). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1100. A bill for the relief of Emilio Bellini; with amendment (Rept. No. 819). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1102. A bill for the relief of Emilio Torres; without amendment (Rept. No. 820). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1816. A bill for the relief of Shoemon

Takano; with amendment (Rept. No. 821). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1818. A bill for the relief of Hugo Fuchino; with amendment (Rept. No. 822). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 823). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 630. An act to suspend until August 15, 1951, the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; without amendment (Rept. No. 824). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5096. A bill to repeal the authority of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Army to nominate certain additional midshipmen and cadets to the United States Naval Academy and the United States Military Academy, respectively; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 5097. A bill to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 5098. A bill to amend chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code regarding fraud and false statements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 5099. A bill to provide for the national defense and for conservation and public development and beneficial public use of the undeveloped water power of Niagara Falls and the Niagara River in the State of New York, in accordance with the provisions of the Niagara Redevelopment Treaty between the United States and Canada, ratified by the Senate of the United States on August 9, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin:

H. R. 5100. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 5101. A bill to exclude from the definition of employment, services performed by part-time workers regularly attending an educational institution; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCKINNON:

H. R. 5102. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to enlarge existing water-supply facilities for the San Diego, Calif., area in order to insure the existence of an adequate water supply for naval and Marine Corps installations and defense-production plants in such area; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 5103. A bill to provide for the refund or credit of the internal-revenue tax paid on spirits lost or rendered unmarketable by reason of the floods of 1951 where such spirits were in the possession of (1) the original taxpayer or rectifier for bottling or use in rectification under Government supervision as provided by law and regulations; or (2) a

wholesale or retail liquor dealer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 375. Resolution creating a Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. Res. 379. Resolution creating a Select Committee To Conduct an Investigation and Study of the Missouri Basin; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 5104. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inge L. Curtis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5105. A bill for the relief of Zoe Zitsa Casanova, also known as Zoe Riginos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 5106. A bill for the relief of Louis E. Gabel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H. R. 5107. A bill for the relief of Margarite Mary Fujita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 5108. A bill for the relief of Nicola Lucia, and Rocco Fierro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 5109. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Kejler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 5110. A bill for the relief of Adelheid Wichman (now Adelheid Waitschies); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCKINNON:

H. R. 5111. A bill for the relief of Jaroslav, Bozena, Yvonka, and Jarda Ondricek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 5112. A bill for the relief of Isabel Toldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. J. Res. 312. Joint resolution to authorize the President to issue posthumously to the late Karl L. Polifka, colonel, Air Force of the United States, a commission as brigadier general, Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

380. Mr. NORBLAD presented a petition of Mrs. W. E. Hayner and other members of the First Christian Church, Mill City, Oreg., urging enactment of legislation to prohibit alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio and television and in magazines and newspapers; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 10, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, August 1, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, who in every age hast inspired the prophets and sages of truth, let us be assured of